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Abstract

The thesis is devoted to the Cologne burgher Hermann von Weinsberg (1518-1597). In his vast diary, which is one of the main sources of the history of sixteenth-century Cologne, Weinsberg collected many topical news items, partly based on printed news. The thesis aims to study the methods Weinsberg selected, described, edited and interpreted his news material through the examination of some selected items of news. The comparisons with the original texts highlights the characteristics of the printed news as well, showing the similarities and differences between pamphlets and newsletters made for sale and private records in terms of information gathering, accuracy, elaboration, style, commentaries, etc. The aim of the study is to examine these interactions and transitions between the different genres, between print and manuscript.
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Introduction

The “printing revolution”\(^1\) is a prime example of media change, both in the public and in the private spheres. However, this change was not a linear progress: there were frequent overlaps between the two forms, the manuscript and the print throughout the early modern period.\(^2\) Several kinds of printed news genres were available in the sixteenth century on the German news market: leaflets, varied types of pamphlets, newsletters, *Neue Zeitungen*, *Messrelationen*, and so on. At the same time, a great number of non-official, handwritten diaries or local chronicles have also survived from this period which describe not only family affairs but often public events, written by city-dwellers interested in public affairs.

The topic of the thesis is the comparison of these two genres, namely the diaries and the printed materials, in order to examine how the printed news available on the market appears in handwritten diaries and influenced them.

Although the study of early modern communication is a long established field within history writing with almost “traditional” research topics including the emergence of newspapers and journalism, the development of postal systems, the speed with which news travelled, etc., interest has increased in recent decades as a consequence of the information revolution. News networks and the international flow of news\(^3\) are among the most popular research areas and there is increasing attention to the question of language and rhetoric.

---

applied in news. Another recent trend is the examination of the function, consumption and reception of news. Still, there are very few articles (Alexandra Schäfer, Silvia Serena Tschopp, Michiel van Groesen, etc.) and monographs (Jeroen Blaak, Tom Hamilton, Kate Loveman, Benedikt Mauer, etc.) which address explicitly the questions of news procurement and handling in diaries and journals.

The thesis will concentrate on one selected diary written by Hermann von Weinsberg (1518-1597), a burgher in Cologne, in one of the most important news and press centres of Europe. By doing so, the thesis intends to answer questions regarding the sources of his news (where and from whom did Weinsberg obtain his information), his selection criteria (which pieces of news were considered by him to be worth to be recorded and which were

neglected), his editing techniques (how did he describe his news, how did he alter his source texts) and finally, his interpretations and comments on the news he recorded.

Regarding methodology, looking for similarities and differences between texts of printed pamphlets and handwritten diaries obviously requires a comparative approach. The contrasting or juxtaposing of the texts can be done at multiple levels. Firstly, it will involve the examination of the patterns of selection (inclusion, exclusion) of whole texts or parts of texts. Secondly, it will be useful to examine the structure of the narration, “narrative styles and textual models.”15 Thirdly, it will be worth analyzing the differences of the small units and details (names, etc.). Thus the research will be based on a “close reading” of the text variations. However, this close reading hopefully will shed light on broader contexts as well: on the intellectual life of the urban elite, and on the oral, written and printed culture of the sixteenth century as well.

Hermann von Weinsberg: His Life and His Diary

Hermann von Weinsberg was born in 1518 in an emerging wine merchant family.16 He attended the University of Cologne where he graduated with a law degree in 1543. However, he never worked as a lawyer, he earned his living as a wine merchant and from different other incomes instead. He first became city councillor in 1543 and later he was re-elected ten times. Meanwhile he was churchwarden of his parish church St. Jakob and kept records of the

---


affairs of the parish.\textsuperscript{17} Thus he belonged to the decision-making elite of the city. He was fond of books and reading and had a considerable home library. Although he married wealthy widows twice, both marriages remained childless. His only illegitimate daughter became a nun and in his old age he lived with his brother and sister while his financial position was deteriorating.

He started to write his extremely detailed diary he himself called \textit{Gedenkbuch} in 1560. It comprises three parts: the \textit{Liber Iuventutis} (Book of Youth) covers the years between 1518 and 1577, the second part, the \textit{Liber Senectutis} (Book of Old Age) is about the years between 1578 and 1587 and the last part, the \textit{Liber Decrepitudinis} (Book of Decrepitude) covers his last years from 1588 and ends with an unfinished sentence in February 1597. The three volumes are together 2042 folio pages long and one of the main sources of the history of sixteenth-century Cologne.\textsuperscript{18} The first part of the \textit{Liber Iuventutis} is a retrospective memoire, the day to day diary starts in 1560. This thesis will concentrate mainly on the \textit{Liber Senectutis} and on the \textit{Liber Decrepitudinis}. Although childless, Weinberg hoped that his family would survive and wrote his diary or family chronicle\textsuperscript{19} to the future head of the Weinsberg family.\textsuperscript{20} It describes the life of Weinsberg and the city surrounding him in an extremely detailed way as well as gives pieces of advice to his imaginary heirs. He wrote his

\textsuperscript{20} W I 1, “Dem erenthaften fleisligsten zukunftigen hausfatter zu Weinsberch, minem geliebten erben.”
diaries for posterity, but as he clearly stated, he had written it for family members only, not for everyone, thus his diary was neither entirely private nor entirely public.

The Cologne burgher Hermann von Weinsberg’s vast diary is a remarkable source for the history of writing and reading and for the dissemination of news. His circumstances—being a university graduate, living in a big city, being a city councillor and being rich enough to have plenty of free time—and his personal curiosity all contributed to the creation of this exceptional diary. However, this diary is part of the genre of the handwritten news diaries, which was proliferating in the early modern period, partly as a result of the printing revolution. Georg Kölderer (c.1550-1607) in Augsburg, Walter Younge (1579-1649) in Devon, John Rous (1588-1644) in Suffolk, Nehemiah Wallington (1598-1658) and Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) in London, Jan de Boer (1694-1764) in Amsterdam all wrote thousands of pages full with news.

21 W S 6r, “Dem erbaren vorsigtigen vornemen hausfatter zu Weinsberch.”
24 John Rous, Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Camden Society, 1856).
Chapter I. Places of News Acquisition in Cologne

Cities have always been hubs for exchange of information. In the second half of the sixteenth century Cologne with its approximately 35,000-40,000 inhabitants, strong trading and intellectual connections even outside the Holy Roman Empire—especially with the Low Countries, England and France—and with its university was one of the most important news and most prolific printing centres not only of the Empire but of whole Europe. However, Cologne’s greatest importance lay in the fact that it was not only a major printing centre but it was the only one major Catholic printing centre in the Empire.

Within this buzzing information centre, for Weinsberg himself one of the most important locations of getting news was his own house. He lived in the house called zur Cronenberg on the street Uff der Bach, near the Hohe Pforte. We can assume that letters were delivered to him there, although at least once he was delivered letters at the Cologne Cathedral. Although letters were probably the least important sources of information for Weinsberg, sometimes he managed to get news even from abroad through his network of correspondents. His nephew, Tilman Ordenbach, who was the councillor of the bishop of Strasbourg contracted him frequently and furnished him with information from Strasbourg.

33 W D 378v, 7 September 1594.
and from France.\textsuperscript{34} Occasionally he even forwarded him letters which were initially written to the bishop.\textsuperscript{35}

His younger brother, Gottschalk (1532-1597), who lived in the neighbouring house (Haus Weinsberg), also had his own network of foreign correspondents.\textsuperscript{36} For instance, in 1580 he was given a letter from a certain Florenz Wilhmin in The Hague.\textsuperscript{37} Being an officer, Gottschalk got official letters as well, which often contained public news.\textsuperscript{38} Since these letters are mentioned in the diary, it is obvious that Weinsberg had read these letters or at least the two brothers had talked about the content of these letters.

The delivery of the letters seems to be somehow random. Usually youngsters, younger family members or servants were sent with letters to the addressees.\textsuperscript{39} Weinsberg also sent his letters with his nephew.\textsuperscript{40} But he was given letters delivered by one of his former neighbours,\textsuperscript{41} and at one occasion, when a previously unknown relative, Jakob Fischbach, the mayor of Bacharach wrote him a letter (on 19 January 1588), it was delivered (on 25 January 1588) personally to Weinsberg by Wilhelm Borggreif, a wine merchant who lived in Strasbergergasse.\textsuperscript{42}

At the end of the sixteenth century letters started to be delivered by the regular post. For instance, his younger sister, Sibilla (1537-1598) was given official letters by post in 1596. On this occasion the diarist mused on the usefulness of this wonderful new institution at length, not so much on its fastness but rather on is predictability and reliability and on the

\textsuperscript{34} W S 666v, 17 August 1587.
\textsuperscript{35} W S 686v, 26 November 1587.
\textsuperscript{36} Lundin, \textit{Paper Memory}, 251.
\textsuperscript{37} W S 212v, 6 July 1580.
\textsuperscript{38} W S 325r, 13 January 1582.
\textsuperscript{39} W D 352v, 21 March 1594.; W D 360v, 8 May 1594.; W D 378v, 8 September 1594.
\textsuperscript{40} W D 124v, 29 May 1589.
\textsuperscript{41} W D 313v, 17 May 1593.
\textsuperscript{42} W D 19v, 25 January 1588.
fact that the sender has nothing to care for.\textsuperscript{43} The postmaster Jacob Henot (1534-1625) had two post offices, one on the Glockengasse and the other near the Alt St. Paul church where he collected the letters to be sent.\textsuperscript{44} The post played an important role in disseminating news as well: Weinsberg first mentioned in 1582 that news from Antwerp arrived in Cologne by post.\textsuperscript{45}

Weinsberg’s house was an important centre of news received by word of mouth as well. Sometimes he heard rumours in his own room (on the first floor of his house) from neighbours, as it happened during an upheaval in 1581.\textsuperscript{46} Sometimes his parish priest reached him with news, for example that all priests assembled in the church St. Kolumba to have a discussion on the newly appointed papal legate.\textsuperscript{47} Weinsberg frequently talked about news during meals with his extended family, both on everyday meals and on festive occasions.\textsuperscript{48} For example, on St Basil Day in 1585 they were talking about “severe news,” among others from France, regarding the possible successors of Henry III (1574-1589).\textsuperscript{49} He could also get news when he visited his acquaintances. For example, at the end of the year 1588 Weinsberg had a nice conversation on the greatest political events of the year with a group of sixteen persons who were guests at a meal held after a funeral.\textsuperscript{50}

Other important locations were the churches and their surroundings. As noted above, Weinsberg was delivered letters at the Cathedral and one of the post offices was also near to a church. The diarist first heard the scandalous news of a “non-Catholic” sermon preached in

\textsuperscript{43} W D 479r, 21 September 1595.
\textsuperscript{45} W S 332v, 18 March 1582.
\textsuperscript{46} W S 300v, 4 August 1581.
\textsuperscript{47} W D 352r, 12 March 1594.
\textsuperscript{48} W S 34v, “Vom dischs und kost.”
\textsuperscript{49} W S 489r, 3 February, 1585.
\textsuperscript{50} W D 94r, 23 December 1588.
front of the city walls in the Cathedral. The edict of the city council regarding the commerce of basic foodstuff was published in four places in Cologne in 1594, among them in front of the churches St. Apern and St. Paul.

Churches were the primary sources of news regarding religious life as well. Both the new calendar of Gregory XIII (1572-1585) and the application of the new rules of marriages in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent were announced from the pulpits. The role of monastic orders was also important. For instance, Weinsberg once heard the reading of a letter which was sent from Nijmegen to the prior of the Carmelites in Cologne. Unfortunately he does not mention where this reading of the letter took place. Weinsberg also had information on the papal legate’s letters addressed to the cloisters in 1594 and on the correspondence of the Cathedral chapters.

But probably the most important places, where citizens of Cologne could obtain news were the streets and squares of the city. This is obviously related to the important role of oral transmission of news. Consequently, it is not surprising that in the most cases Weinsberg could not locate the source of this type of news, although he could remember the time when the news arrived in the city. Sometimes he recorded that “in the city,” “everyone,” the “folk” or the “burgers” were talking about certain news. Printed Neue Zeitungen,

51 W S 347v, 8 July 1582.
52 W D 384r, 30 September 1594.
53 W S 428v, 27 October 1583; W D 226r, 28 July 1591.
54 W D 135v, 11 Aug 1589.
55 W D 389v, 20 October 1594; W D 217v, 10 May 1591.
56 W S 342v, 1 June 1582.
57 W S 416r, 16 August 1583; W S 671v, 12 September 1587.
58 W S 66v, 20 March 1578.
59 W S 561r, 27 February 1586.
60 W D 426v, 19 February 1595.
61 W S 66v, 20 March 1578.
Flugschriften and other leaflets, pamphlets and newsbooks as well as engravings could also be bought on the streets.\footnote{W S 693r, 29 December 1587.}

However, in some exceptional cases he could remember exactly where he heard certain sensational news. For example, the first account of the seizure of Neuss by the army of Gebhard Truchsess (1547-1601) arrived in Cologne at around lunch time on 9 May 1585 and spread immediately throughout the city. The seizure actually happened at three o’clock in the morning, which means that it took approximately nine or ten hours to the news to cover the 40 kilometres distance. Weinsberg first heard about it at around two o’clock from his stepson on the street Am Malzbüchel when he was walking to the Weinschoelen. Later he heard the news from many other persons in the Weinschoelen, among them from eyewitnesses. Since news kept coming, the council decided to send out messengers to learn what had happened.\footnote{W S 502r, 9 May 1585.} At another occasion the news of the above-mentioned “non-Catholic” sermon preached in front of the city walls at nine o’clock arrived “already” by ten o’clock at the Cathedral, the very centre of Cologne, where Weinsberg first heard about it.\footnote{W S 347v, 8 July 1582.}

Moreover, there were certain other places where information most likely could be gathered. These can be pinpointed by listing the places where official publications were announced. Unfortunately Weinsberg usually merely wrote that the edicts of the city council were announced “in many places”\footnote{W S 347v, 8 July 1582.} or “on the customary places.”\footnote{W D 486v, 4 October 1595.} However, they were definitely announced in front of the city gates, which had probably a symbolic meaning as well.\footnote{ibid.} The city gates played a significant role otherwise, too. In 1585 the envoy from Neuss
carrying an official letter arrived late night at the Severintor and presented the letter to the watchers there. The news of this letter spread quickly both within and outside Cologne.\textsuperscript{68}

Other important places of news acquisition were the squares and markets. After the seizure of Bonn in 1587 refugees from the city arrived at the Rathausplatz and recounted the story of the occupation to the people there.\textsuperscript{69} The two other places besides the churches where the edict of the city council on the regulation of commerce was published were the Waidmarkt and the Neumarkt.\textsuperscript{70}

Among all markets probably the Heumarkt was the most significant. For instance, in 1583 when the mayor of Cologne was given a letter from Truchsess, with whom the city was at war, the mayor hastened to make the content of the letter immediately known: he commanded the courier to go to the Heumarkt during the time of the \textit{burse}\textsuperscript{71} and deliver a copy of the letter to the merchants.\textsuperscript{72} The news of the seizure of La Fère by the French King Henry IV (1589-1610) in France was first available also on the \textit{burse}.\textsuperscript{73} In March 1582, when there was no certain news available in Cologne about the “result” of the assassination attempt of William the Silent (1533-1584) in Antwerp people on the \textit{bursen} and on the Heumarkt made bets whether the prince was still alive or not.\textsuperscript{74} In the summer of 1588 Weinsberg was extremely surprised that not even foreigners—Italian, Portuguese or Dutch—knew anything certain about the fate of the Spanish Armada and he was unable to obtain any information either on the Heumarkt or on the \textit{burse}.\textsuperscript{75} The role of merchants and factors was extremely

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{68} W S 505v, 27 May 1585.
\item \textsuperscript{69} W S 691v, 23 December 1587.
\item \textsuperscript{70} W D 384r, 30 September 1594.
\item \textsuperscript{72} W D 419v, 6 September 1583.
\item \textsuperscript{73} W D 536r, 16 May 1596.
\item \textsuperscript{74} W S 332v, 18 March 1582.
\item \textsuperscript{75} W D 68v, 2 September 1588.
\end{itemize}
important in the transmission of news, not merely in the case of economic news but they were crucial participants of the long-distance transmission of news, too, and Weinsberg was well aware of this fact.77

For the decision-making elite the city council was apparently a significant location of obtaining information. For example, the news of the seizure of Bonn reached Cologne at eight o’clock on 23 December 1587. Weinsberg was first informed about it an hour later by a certain Wilhelm Ross when the diarist was going to the council. News reached the city council one after the other while Weinsberg was sitting there (probably in the building of the Rathaus). Later on the same day many people fleeing from Bonn arrived “at the square” (probably at the Rathausplatz) in miserable condition and the city officials decided to send out a messenger to learn what had happen. On the next day more refugees arrived from Bonn in Cologne and each of them recounted the events differently, to Weinsberg’s frustration.78 The official correspondence of the city with the Emperor was also done by the city council,79 but Weinsberg usually knew about it from hearsay only.

Printing shops obviously also played an important role in the transmission of information. The leading printing shops could be found near the Cathedral in the street Unter Fettenhennen, where a quarter of printers had emerged by the sixteenth century. This phenomenon resembles the situation in London where printers also concentrated around St Paul’s Cathedral.80 For example, one of the printers Weinsberg knew, Gottfried von Kempen lived near to the Cathedral, in the house Arnfeldt on the street Burgmauren in 1588,81 where Kempen printed the first Messrelationen among other products. Later Kempen moved to the

76 W S 325r, 13 January 1582.
77 W D 23r, 7 February 1588.
78 W D 691v, 23 December 1587.
79 W D 174v, 15 April 1590.
Mariengartengasse. Another printer, Nikolaus Schreiber also lived relatively close to the Cathedral, in the house Under Sechszehen Häusern on the street Unter Sachsenhausen between 1587 and 1592. Another author of publications bought by Weinsberg was Konrad Löw, who worked with the printer Wilhelm von Lützenkirchen. Lützenkirchen also lived on the Mariengartengasse, where he had a book shop beside his printing shop. Frans Hogenberg (1535-1590), whose engravings Weinsberg adored and frequently bought lived in den Fellen uf der Bach, that is probably close to the diarist’s own house.

To sum up, “transmission of information is profoundly anchored in urban space” and even some “hot spots” can be pinpointed where Weinsberg could gather information. These spots were the very places where the “sense of the ‘public’” started to emerge at the end of the sixteenth century.

The city as a community played an important role in influencing the transmission of news in another way as well, namely through censorship. Printing, which enabled the quick and wide dissemination of ideas was perceived by early modern authorities as an institution which should be strictly controlled. The authorities’ fear of the impact of print on “common folk” was a widespread phenomenon and shows very well how deeply print could influence the—mostly illiterate—population. There were many cases when the Cologne city council intervened into the business of printing. For instance, the council prohibited to print anything

---

82 Reske, Die Buchdrucker, 454.
84 W D 531r, 4 May 1596.
86 W D 257r, 26 February 1592.
87 Ursula Mielke, Remigius and Frans Hogenberg (Amsterdam: Sound & Vision Publishers-Rijksmuseum, 2009), xxv.
91 Creasman, Censorship, 3, 26.
on the massacre at Junkersdorf in 1586 when approximately hundred innocent civilians going
to the weekly market to Cologne were killed and at least another hundred injured in an
ambush by the soldiers of Ernest of Bavaria (1554–1612), the Archbishop and Elector of
Cologne. The surviving copy of the engraving has a caption stating that “an unchristian,
undeserved murder is committed by Ernest, Bishop of Cologne,”92 which clearly explains
the reason of the prohibition. However, Weinsberg—himself a member of the city council—
expressed that he did not really understand the reason why it was censored since many other
events were allowed to be printed, although he did not question the right of the authorities to
censor anything they wanted.93 Weinsberg very much wanted to get an engraving by
Hogenberg about the massacre, and decided to ignore the decision of the council.94 Probably
he felt it more important to provide an account for his readers in his diary than obeying the
rules of the council or maybe he thought that the ban applied to the “common people” only,
those who could not be trusted to be able to distinguish truth from error,95 not for the learned
and educated. He does not states that he bought the engraving itself but he finally managed to
take a look at the engraving and copied the poem printed under the engraving into his diary.96
Another occasion was the execution of Hieronymus Michaelis in 1587. In this case
Weinsberg understood the motivation of the city council: Michaelis was the commissioner of
the Elector of Cologne and the aim of the prohibition was not to upset the Elector even
more.97 He also understood the reason for suppressing all news about the major military
victories of Henry IV in France, because it would stir up the “folk”98—he obviously did not

92 Frans Hogenberg, *Die Greuliche Morderei bei Jonckersdorff, 1586.*, engraving, 1586–1588; available online,
accessed 31 March 2018
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Junkersdorf_Massacre_(1586),_engraved_by_Frans_Hogenberg.jpg
93 W S 586v, 15 July 1586.
94 “besorgte ich sult der gein feil bekomen” W S 586v, 15 July 1586.
96 W S 586v, 15 July 1586.
97 W S 667r, 22 August 1587; Wolfgang Schmid, “‘Am Brunnen vor dem Tore…’ Zur Freizeitgestaltung der
Stadtbevölkerung im 15./16. Jahrhundert,” in *Die Stadt und ihr Rand*, ed. Peter Johanek (Cologne: Böhlau,
2008), 60.
98 W D 351r, 4 March 1594.
think of himself as belonging to the “folk.” However, Weinsberg’s opinion was that it would better to know these important events and it was impossible to keep them secret forever anyway. Thus Weinsberg clearly demanded to be informed by the authorities at least in the case of major political and military events.

As a different way of influencing common opinion the city council sometimes commissioned the publication of certain prints, which could also be suspicious in the eyes of the citizens. For example, Weinsberg recorded that in 1579—when the peace negotiation during the Dutch revolt between the Dutch and the Spanish took place in Cologne—it was much talked within the city why the proposal of the Spanish had been printed out in Cologne while that of the United Provinces had not.

---

99 W D 351r, 4 March 1594.
100 W S 388r, 22 January 1583.
Chapter II. The Variety of News in Cologne and in Weinsberg’s Diary

To get a glimpse of the amount and variety of news available on the news market in Cologne, from which Weinsberg could select information to insert into his diary and to shed light on his criteria of selection this chapter compares the news of the diary with that of the biannual printed newsbooks called Messrelationen published also in Cologne in the same time period. Messrelationen were small size booklets of approximately 100 pages, published twice yearly to the spring and autumn Frankfurt Book Fairs, containing reports about events that had occurred since the previous Book Fair. The emergence of the genre is associated with Michael von Aitzing (c.1530-1598), a university-educated polyglot, who lived in Cologne in the 1580s and 1590s as a professional newswriter.

This chapter examines one selected year (1588). Since Messrelationen were published biannually, three Messrelationen cover the entire year. The first contains news until the end of April 1588,\(^{101}\) the second between the end of April and 15 September,\(^{102}\) and the third from 15 September until the end of the year.\(^{103}\) The chapters separated by titles in the Messrelationen and the entries in Weinsberg’s diary are considered as one single item of news even though the length of both the chapters and diary entries can differ considerably.

\(^{101}\) Michael von Aitzing, Postrema Relatio historica Das ist, die Leste historisch Beschreybung, zu wissen, Was sich nit allein im Niderlandt und Erzstifft Cöllen (als um Bonn, und derselben Belegerung) sonder auch in Engellandt, Frankreich und Teutschlandt. Item in Poln, und andern orten zugetragen ... biß auff Jetzt ablauffenden April 1588... Cologne: Gottfried von Kempen, 1588 [VD16 E 4791]; available online: “VD16 E 4791,” Bibliotheksverbund Bayern, accessed 13 April 2018, http://gateway-bayern.de/VD16+E+4791 [hereafter M1].


However, if it is clear that there are many completely different news items attached under one chapter heading or into one diary entry, which is a frequent phenomenon in the case of the Messrelationen, but also appears in the diary of Weinsberg, then they are treated as separate items of news. Every news item is associated with one single date and one single place of origin.

There are 123 news items in the three Messrelationen—17, 68 and 38, respectively—and 97 news items in Weinsberg’s diary from the year 1588. It is surprising that the difference between a professional newswriter and a private person’s records is not too significant in terms of “amount” of news.

Both Aitzing and Weinsberg tried to maintain a chronological order, but they did not always manage to do so. Both of them inserted large amounts of background information between their news, which compromised the chronological order. For instance, Aitzing’s third Messrelation is supposedly about the events between September 1588 and April 1589, but contains a chapter on the Day of the Barricades, with proper references to the pages of the previous Messrelation where the curious reader can find further information. Weinsberg obviously also wrote his diary in a chronological order and he also frequently referred back to information mentioned earlier in his diary to create a coherent and continuous narrative and to raise the attention of the readers to the relationship between the events—but which at the same time improved his understanding of politics as well. For example, in November 1587 he emphasised that he had already dealt with certain French issues “above on folio 666

---

104 For example there are reports from the Empire, France and England under one chapter heading which refers to the city of Bonn only, M1, 115.
105 W D 10r, 1 January 1588.
106 M3, 13.
107 W D 68r, 2 September 1588.
He both used to refer to page numbers and to dates.\footnote{WS 687v, 26 November 1587. W D 170v, 14 March 1590.}

Out of the diary’s 97 news items, 78 (80 per cent) are about the Cologne War (mostly about events around Bonn) and merely 18 (20 per cent) came from outside the Empire (see Table 1). The large amount of news originating from the local region clearly shows the limited scope of Weinsberg’s world in contrast with that of Aitzing’s, who could provide information to his readers from a wider geographical area, for example from Denmark, Turkey, Persia, and who had access to news from important centres of power (Prague, Rome) as well, whereas news regarding the Cologne War accounts for merely 22 per cent in Aitzing’s works. Probably Aitzing wanted to offer news from a wider geographical area to his consumers, which were not easily available from oral or handwritten sources, while Weinsberg based his diary more on these sources.\footnote{Eva-Maria Schnurr, Religionskonflikt und Öffentlichkeit: eine Mediengeschichte des Kölner Kriegs (1582 bis 1590) (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009), 472.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Messrelationen</th>
<th>per cent</th>
<th>Diary</th>
<th>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cologne war</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21,9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21,1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia (Prague)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Countries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (Rome)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey &amp; Persia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of the news according to their origin in Weinsberg’s diary and in *Messrelationen* published in Cologne in 1588.

Regarding the news from abroad in this selected year, Weinsberg deals mostly with the events of the Wars of Religion in France (peace negotiations,\(^{112}\) the Day of Barricades,\(^{113}\) the Edict of Union,\(^{114}\) and the murder of the Guise brothers\(^{115}\)), with the Dutch revolt (report on a placard which prohibited the exercise of the Catholic religion in Utrecht\(^{116}\) and three items of news on the siege of Bergen op Zoom\(^{117}\)) and with the campaign of the Spanish Armada against England, which will be dealt in a following chapter. He also mentions the

\(^{112}\) W D 17v, 9 January, 1588.
\(^{113}\) W D 40v, 12 May, 1588.
\(^{115}\) W D 94r, 23 December 1588.
\(^{117}\) W D 71r, 20 September, W D 80r, 20 October and W D 82r, 31 October 1588.
conflicts regarding the election of the new Polish king\textsuperscript{118} and the Battle of Szikszó in Hungary in October.\textsuperscript{119}

On the other hand, Aitzing has not merely more information, especially about the events (negotiations between the parties, general assembly held in Blois in October,\textsuperscript{120} etc.), the continuous fighting in France\textsuperscript{121} and about news from the Low Countries (for example he has detailed information about the English and Spanish troops stationed there as well as about the death of the Earl of Leicester (1532-1588), the former Governor of the United Provinces\textsuperscript{122}) but he is the one who has information at all about diplomacy\textsuperscript{123} and about the events from within royal courts.\textsuperscript{124} Consequently the scope of persons mentioned is also wider in the Messrelationen. For instance, in a report about the brightness of the young Spanish Crown Prince there is a huge list of prominent persons of the Spanish royal court who all witnessed the intelligent responses of the future Philip III (1598-1621).\textsuperscript{125}

As all these show, the vast majority of the accounts are military and political news both in the Messrelationen and in the diary. In this particular year there is only one item of sensational news\textsuperscript{126} in the Messrelationen, Weinsberg mentions it three times in his diary.\textsuperscript{127} There is hardly any economic news: for instance the diarist records that the Duke of Jülich (1539-1592) abolished the new toll on the Rhine,\textsuperscript{128} and Aitzing reports the arrival of a fleet from India with exotic species and timber.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{118} W D 10v, 1 January 1588; W D 23r, 7 February 1588.
\textsuperscript{119} W D 74v, 8 October 1588.
\textsuperscript{120} M3, 80.
\textsuperscript{121} M2,108-109.
\textsuperscript{123} M2, 72.
\textsuperscript{124} M2, 96.
\textsuperscript{125} M3, 30-32.
\textsuperscript{126} M3, 82.
\textsuperscript{127} W D 73r, 29 September, 1588; W D 73v, 3 October, 1588; W D 81r, 26 October, 1588.
\textsuperscript{128} W D 87v, 26 November, 1588.
\textsuperscript{129} M2, 103.
To write up his *Messrelationen*, Aitzing frequently used printed sources. For example, he reprinted in the *Messrelation* his own translation of a Spanish pamphlet on the muster of the Armada,\(^{130}\) which he published earlier separately as well.\(^{131}\) He sometimes printed his sources verbatim or with very little change in phrasing, especially in the case of official publications. Sometimes he did not even change the narrator’s first person account.\(^{132}\) As it will be shown later, Weinsberg also paid special attention to official publications. In some cases it is probable that both the diarist and the newswriter used the same source. The insertion of the Treaty of Nemours—which was signed three years earlier—into the current events in Weinsberg’s diary is due to the fact that it was printed together in the pamphlet Weinsberg used with the Edict of Union.\(^{133}\) Aitzing also printed the two edicts together in the same order and he also did not mention that the Treaty of Nemours was signed years earlier.

However, Aitzing was very conscious regarding conflicting accounts, sometimes he even deliberately tried to balance between them. For instance, in the third *Messrelation* he told his readers that since he had published a Spanish publication on the Armada in his previous *Messrelation*, in this issue he was going to publish a translation of an English publication (translated from Italian), in order to give equal space to both sides.\(^{134}\) For the same reason he sometimes juxtaposed his news in the *Messrelation*. Regarding the preparation of the Spanish Armada, he first printed an account on preparations in Portugal

\(^{130}\) M2, 79-94.
\(^{132}\) “in unser Statt Pariß,” M3, 1; “so haben wir uns (sagt der König weiter) entschlossen” M3, 4.
\(^{133}\) W D 54v, 21 July, 1588.
\(^{134}\) M3, 56-57.
and in the next chapter he published a report on the preparation for defence against the invasion in England.135

On the other hand most of Weinsberg’s information comes from oral sources, which he sometimes indicates with the expressions ‘it is said” or “allegedly.”136 The frequent occurrence of these expressions shows that rumour and oral news played an important role in news dissemination. The fact that the news arrived continually and the lack of contradictory news were the best signs for Weinsberg whether an oral account was true or not.137

However, he tended to trust printed news more because he considered them as more reliable: he did not believe news which sounded incredible at first until there was no printed confirmation of it.138 For instance, in 1593 Weinsberg heard the information that a new king was crowned in France. Next time, when he managed to acquire printed news he specifically searched for information in the text regarding a new king.139 What “was conveyed by word of mouth, [was] … subsequently reinforced in print.”140

All the same, in some cases he rejected using printed material. This was the case, for example, in 1587 when he acquired printed news—a pamphlet consisting of three pieces—from France on the fights between the different parties. But, according to Weinsberg, they were disgusting and everyone in France wrote what he liked and what was useful for him. That was the reason why he, Weinsberg was not willing to recount them.141 In the case of the execution of the kidnappers in Cologne he rejected copying a poem, which accompanied the

135 M2, 41-44.
136 “man sagt”, “sagt man,” e.g. W D 17v, 12 January, 1588.
137 W D 64r, 12 August 1588; W D 94v, 23 December 1588.
138 W D 64r, 12 August 1588.
139 W D 320v, 1 August 1593.
140 Andrew Pettegree, Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8.
141 W 686v, 26 November 1587.
engraving because of its low quality, saying that the poet must have been in a hurry when writing it.\footnote{WD 81v, 26 October 1588.}

It is not surprising, that all news appearing in Weinsberg’s diary in 1588 can be found in the \textit{Messrelationen}. But overlap does not necessarily mean that they cover the same information. For instance, Weinsberg reported that Archduke Maximilian (1558-1618) was taken prisoner in Poland but according to his knowledge, he was the properly crowned king of Poland. He also mentioned a battle in Poland.\footnote{WD 23r, 7 February, 1588.} Aitzing was usually better informed, in this case too: he knew that eventually Sigismund III Vasa (1587-1632) was crowned.\footnote{M1, 103.} Aitzing was able to give an independent chapter on the battle.\footnote{M1, 104.}

There is also a huge difference in the elaboration of the accounts. For instance, the diarist merely mentioned, probably based on oral sources that the English Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) sent an embassy to Turkey,\footnote{WD 86r, 13 November 1588.} whereas the newswriter published her entire letter addressed to the Ottoman Sultan in Latin.\footnote{M3, 44-48.}

In the case of this selected year Weinsberg mentioned merely eleven times explicitly that he used printed material among his 97 diary entries which report topical news. Most probably he must have used printed material many more times.\footnote{Eva-Maria Schnurr, “‘Jedem anbringer gleub ich so bait nit.’ Informationsbeschaffung und Mediennutzung des Kölner Bürgers Hermann Weinsberg während des Kölner Kriegs (1582 bis 1590),” \textit{Geschichte in Köln} 56, no. 1 (2009): 182.} For example he has a passing remark when describing the current situation in Europe at the beginning of the year that according to a piece of printed news recently published, the Scottish King, James VI (1567-1625) was held almost like prisoner by his subjects.\footnote{WD 10r, 1 January 1588.} Printed news must have been
rather commonplace, everyday object for him by the 1580s. On the other hand in most of the cases Weinsberg merely wrote “news arrived,” which did not necessarily mean printed news.

Consequently, this low number of printed news probably shows the cases when Weinsberg wanted to emphasise that he used printed material for writing up his diary. These pieces of news deal either with the events in France (the Day of the Barricades, the Edict of Union and the assassination of the Guise brothers) or with the campaign of the Spanish Armada (four times) and with Scotland. In two cases he acquired engravings, on the funeral of Johann Batista Taxis von Taxis (1546-1588) in Bonn and on the execution of some kidnappers in Cologne.

The number of cases when Weinsberg explicitly states that he had actually bought printed news or engravings is even lower: merely eight in the three volumes of the diary. Most probably he must have bought printed materials many more times and he merely did not mention it in the diary. However, it can also mean that he did not own all the printed materials he copied in his diary, maybe he could only take a look at them or borrowed them or they were passed on to him for a little while. In this respect it is noteworthy that in 1595 he started to summarize the content of a 500-page book on the life of Ignatius of Loyola. He borrowed this book from two of his kinwomen and decided to copy it exactly because he got access to it only for a short period. This would explain why he copied his newsletters and
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150 “zeitung kommen,” e.g. W D 17v, 9 January 1588.
151 W D 32v, 20 April 1588.
152 W D 81r, 26 October 1588.
153 Raymond, The Invention of the Newspaper, 65.
154 W D 471v, 30 July 1595.
pamphlets instead of collecting them, unlike some of his contemporaries, Johann Jakob Wick (1522-1588)\textsuperscript{155} or Pierre de L’Estoile (1546-1611).\textsuperscript{156}

Weinsberg paid twelve albi for six “printed paper letters” in 1583\textsuperscript{157} and he bought twenty-one engravings for thirty-two albi in 1585.\textsuperscript{158} Four times he bought texts and four times he bought engravings.\textsuperscript{159} The four pieces of printed news were on the military events in the Netherlands,\textsuperscript{160} on the execution of Mary Stuart (1542-1567),\textsuperscript{161} on the siege of Calais\textsuperscript{162} and on the victories of the Christian armies over the Turks in Hungary.\textsuperscript{163} The topics of the engravings are similar: the Cologne War,\textsuperscript{164} the blowing up a bridge near Antwerp,\textsuperscript{165} the assassination of Henry III\textsuperscript{166} and miscellaneous recent military events from France during 1591 and 1592.\textsuperscript{167}

In the case of engravings sometimes he bought many of them at the same time. In the case of the above mentioned regicide he bought two images and on the latest events of the French wars he bought six engravings. These either depict the same event (the assassination in two different variations) or different events (battles in France in the previous four months) which were connected to each other. In both cases he described the images in his diary and added what people said about them. After buying the six images on the French wars he even

\textsuperscript{155}Matthias Senn, Johann Jakob Wick (1522-1588) und seine Sammlung von Nachrichten zur Zeitgeschichte (Zurich: Leemann AG., 1973).
\textsuperscript{156}Hamilton, Pierre de L’Estoile, 37.
\textsuperscript{157}W S 396r, 23 March 1583.
\textsuperscript{158}W S 486v, 7 January 1585. For a comparison, in 1579 he paid 8 albi for a book (W S 147v, 7 September 1579), and in 1591 he paid 9 mark for another book plus 26 albi more for binding it (W D 230v, 2 September 1591). At approximately the same time one “quart” (1,3-1,4 liter) of wine cost 5-5,5 albi (W S 355r, 19 August 1582) and Weinsberg paid 11,5 marken for a glass window (W S 326r, 19 January 1582).
\textsuperscript{159}On printed images see Wolfgang Harms and Michael Schilling, Das illustrierte Flugblatt der frühen Neuzeit. Traditionen–Wirkungen–Kontexte (Stuttgart: S. Hirzel Verlag, 2008) and Michael Schilling, Bildpublizistik der frühen Neuzeit: Aufgaben und Leistungen des illustrierten Flugblatts in Deutschland bis um 1700 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1990).
\textsuperscript{160}W S 396v, 23 March 1583.
\textsuperscript{161}W S 685v, 25 November 1587.
\textsuperscript{162}W D 531r, 4 May 1596.
\textsuperscript{163}W D 543v, 1 July 1596.
\textsuperscript{164}W S 486v, 7 January 1585.
\textsuperscript{165}W S 492r, 28 February 1585.
\textsuperscript{166}W D 256v, 26 February 1592.
considered gluing them together “to see the whole story together,” but eventually decided against it because it would have needed a lot of work and money.\textsuperscript{168} In 1585 he even bought 21 images by Hogenberg at the same time which depicted miscellaneous events of the Cologne War.\textsuperscript{169} He listed these images in his diary, describing each image with one sentence. He added that he bought them because years later these images would not be available on the market but his descendants, living in a more peaceful world most certainly would enjoy seeing these images and marvel at them.\textsuperscript{170} The role of these engravings would be to teach and please his descendants—docere et delectare. Weinsberg was also aware of the transient character of these printed materials. However, these images were not always reliable. For instance, in 1585 he noted that he had bought an engraving on the explosion of a bridge on the Schelde, which almost killed the Duke of Parma (1545-1592), but he added somewhat angrily, Dutch people told him that the incident happened in a different way than it was depicted.\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{168} W D 256v, 26 February 1592.
\textsuperscript{169} W S 486v, 7 January 1585.
\textsuperscript{170} W S 486v, 7 January 1585.
Chapter III. The Sultan’s Letter (1585)

The following chapters will discuss the methods Weinsberg followed when describing, editing or transforming the news he dealt with as well as his commentaries which accompany the news he collected. One of the methods he applied was to copy the text he acquired word for word. Copying was a very basic practice for the educated and learned throughout the Middle Ages and early modern times. Not only were copying textbooks, compiling commonplace books the most common ways of learning, but the “widespread culture of copying … permeated early modern society” to a very high degree almost in every aspect of life, from the working of government and commerce through social relations to the dissemination of information.

One of the newsletters Weinsberg copied almost verbatim was published in Cologne by Nikolaus Schreiber in 1585. This publication itself claims to be a copy of a diplomatic document, namely of the letter of the Turkish Sultan named in the text as Helj Soliman addressed to the Spanish King, Philip II (1556-1598). The newsletter was also published in Augsburg by Josias Wölri with the very same content and there were versions
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173 Edel Lamb, Reading Children in Early Modern Culture (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 172.
175 Gordon, “Material Fictions,” 86.
176 W S 513r-513v, 19 July 1585.
178 The first part of the name Helj is probably the corrupted form of Haly Bassà or Aly Bassa, who is mentioned in the Italian and Dutch versions of the newsletter as the person who delivered the gifts.
179 Anon., Copey Desz Brieffs so der Türkisch Keyer Heli Soliman, Newlicher zeit dem Großmechtigsten Koenig Philippo inn Hispaniam zugeschreiben vnd verzaichnuß, Was der ermeldt Türkisch Keyer seiner Koenig:Maystat fuer schanckungen ... gesandt hat. Augsburg: Josias Wölri, 1585 [VD16 T 2215]; available
of it published in Italy\textsuperscript{180} and in the Low Countries, where it was printed in Dutch and in French.\textsuperscript{181} Thus the diarist copied a newsletter widely circulated in Europe. There was another newsletter at the same time on the Cologne news market which contained the letters and gifts of both the Persian Shah and the Ottoman Sultan to Philip II, dated to June 1585, also printed by Nikolaus Schreiber.\textsuperscript{182} However, Weinsberg chose the former newsletter to copy in his diary.

The first issue to be noticed is that the reigning Sultan of the Ottoman Empire in 1585 was Murad III (1574-1595), whereas Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566) died almost twenty years earlier, although the title of the newsletter claims that the letter was written “recently.”\textsuperscript{183} Weinsberg did not notice this peculiarity, as he probably did not know the name of the reigning ruler of the Ottoman Empire. In 1566 he mentioned the death of Suleiman and the accession of Murad but referred to them merely as “the old Turk” and “his son.”\textsuperscript{184} In 1595 he was also gladly surprised when he discovered the name of the late and the new Ottoman rulers.\textsuperscript{185}

The suspicion, that the newsletter is an older piece of news is strengthened by the fact that it mentions four lions among the gifts of the Sultan. However, there were reports of four
lions living in a menagerie in Madrid from much earlier. These lions arrived in Spain with
gold lashes and collars, in which the Spanish king’s coat of arms was engraved, exactly the
same way as it is written in the newsletter. The date of their arrival is unknown, but it is
known that one of the lions escaped from the menagerie and had to be hunted down in
1562. Moreover, one version of this newsletter published in Augsburg by Josias Wörli
contains an attachment with news from 1558.

Consequently, the posting of the letter and the sending of the gifts probably took place
between 1556 and 1562. According to the text, the Turks and the Spaniards were about to
sign a peace treaty, thus the letter may be related to the treaty between the Habsburg and
Ottoman Empires on 27 November 1562. I have so far been unable to locate a
contemporary newsletter or record on gifts from the Ottoman emperor to Philip II from
around these years. However, original or fake letters were rather frequently published “in
different periods from their initial composition,” sometimes even decades later.

Consequently, whether this is an original Ottoman letter or—which may also easily be
the case,—a fictitious one, the question arises, why was it published in 1585. The most likely
explanation is maybe that it was the Spanish king who wanted to show how strong and rich
his allies were. The Spanish were fighting in the Low Countries, where they occupied
Brussels in 1585, but the fight was not over and Antwerp was under siege. Moreover, the
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Dutch were in negotiations with the English Queen, Elizabeth I requesting her to aid them. They offered the title of Governor-General of the United Provinces to Elizabeth. Elizabeth rejected the title, however, she promised military aid to the “rebels” in the Treaty of Nonsuch (19 August 1585), which meant that an open war broke out between England and Spain. Thus, this newsletter could be a message not only to the Dutch but also to the English. Furthermore, the English diplomacy tried to persuade the Turks to wage war against Spain or at least to “keep the Spanish forces occupied” in the Mediterranean. Probably this is the reason why the letter emphasises that the Ottoman Empire promised not only to make peace with Spain but also not to enter into an alliance with the enemies of the Spanish king. In contrast, the reality was that the Turks supported the Dutch and the English and generally the Protestants against the Catholic Habsburgs throughout the sixteenth century.

Weinsberg referred back to this letter of the Sultan to the Spanish king in his very next diary entry on the next day, reporting that the inhabitants of Antwerp started to negotiate with the Duke of Parma, the commander of the Spanish army on the surrender of the city. Weinsberg believed that the situation of the Protestant rebels was desperate and it would get even worse if the Spanish king and the Ottoman emperor had indeed agreed and, according to the diarist, this news—regardless whether it was true or doubtful—was partly the reason why the rebels started to negotiate at all. According to Paul Arblaster the intention of the publishers of the letter was indeed to show how mighty the Spanish king’s allies were and Weinsberg interpreted the newsletter exactly in this way. This case clearly shows that Weinsberg not only had a very good overview of the political events throughout Europe and
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193 W S 513v, 20 July 1585.
was able to think in terms of international relations but he was also well aware of the impact even fake news could cause—similarly to the publishers of the letter who chose this rather sophisticated way to influence public opinion and they decision proved to be effective. From another perspective this news could have been interpreted negatively since the Spanish king entered into an alliance with the “archenemies of Christianity.” However, Weinsberg did not mention anything like that. A couple of years later, when recounting the embassy sent to the Sultan by the English queen, Weinsberg also did not express any moral concerns regarding making an alliance with Turks.

Except for his historical summaries there are few topical news items on Turks in the diary before this entry. He usually referred to them in relation to the debates on the special imperial tax for financing the army set up against them (Türkensteuer) or in relation to major decisive battles, such as the siege of Szigetvár in 1566. In the later parts of the diary mentions of Turks become increasingly frequent, especially in the 1590s, in connection with the outbreak of the Long Turkish War.

Weinsberg first summarised the content of the newsletter: this is a short letter from the Sultan to the Spanish king and a list of the gifts Soliman sent to Philip. Although Weinsberg initially claimed that he was summarizing the content of the newsletter with the expression that this would be the “meaning” of the letter, he eventually copied it almost verbatim.
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196 W D 86r, 13 November 1588.
197 For instance in 1578 he recalls the—probably fake—news of the reoccupation of Szigetvár in Hungary by Christian forces. W S 104v, 30 November 1578.
198 W I 520v, September 1566.
199 On the image of Turks see for example Charlotte Colding Smith, Images of Islam, 1453–1600: Turks in Germany and Central Europe (London: Routledge, 2015).
200 “effectus” W S 513r, 19 July 1585.
201 “Diss vorg. ist nit allein effectus, dan tenor et ipsa verba impressi” W S 513r, 19 July 1585.
Weinsberg used different expressions to describe his writing methods. In case he wanted to express that what he did was copying, he used expressions such as “runs as follows,”202 “literally,”203 or “word for word.”204 For instance, in 1581 he copied verbatim a printed protestation of the Archbishop of Cologne, which was made public at the city gates.205 Sometimes he even emphasised that he copied word for word, and he had no intention to add to or take away anything from the original text, like in the case of a report on the battle of Ivry.206 In other cases, when he wanted to summarise the content of his sources, he used expressions like “approximately this is the meaning of the news”207 or “this is the (main) meaning”208 of the text. Sometimes he stated that he abridged the text.209 He also used the word “to extract” to the act the summarizing of a text.210 However, he did not use these expressions consistently.

The expression that this is the “effect” of the letter “but with this opening”211 shows that probably the rhetoric and the style of the letter was what attracted Weinsberg’s attention and that is the reason why he changed his mind and decided to copy the letter instead of summarizing it. The alleged writer of the letter, Soliman starts with the claim that he is above all other kings, presenting himself as a superior leader. Although the formal intitulatio of the standard letters of Suleiman the Magnificent was slightly different, his letters indeed stated that he was the “sultan of sultans,” who was above all other emperors.212 The style and the clarification of the relationship between the author of the letter and the addressee were

202 W I 623r, 23 September 1572; W D 371r, 22 July 1594.
203 W S 300r, 1 August 1581.
204 W S 379r, 19 December 1582.
205 W S 300r, 1 August 1581.
206 W D 170r, 14 March 1590.
207 W D 543v, 1 July 1596.
208 W S 476v, 13 November 1584; W S 128v, 1 June 1579; W S 519v, 17 August 1585.
209 W D 55r, 21 July 1588.
210 W I 622v, 23 September 1572.
211 “ingang” W S 513r, 19 July 1585.
important characteristics of royal correspondence, but the “arrogant language used in the Ottoman court played a notable role in the shaping of the image of the Turk.” Later Weinsberg also encountered pamphlets where the title of the Ottoman Emperor was written similarly but in a Latinized version as soltan sultanoun Amoratus and he also copied it in that exact form.

The second part of the letter contains the list of the gifts sent by the Sultan to the Spanish king. Weinsberg copied basically the entire text, with some slight changes of word order, omissions and reductions. He even copied such remarks as the swords from Damascus were “fine work.” The set of gifts consists of typical oriental luxury items, such as exotic animals, precious jewellery, swords and knives, carpets, horns of unicorns. Despite the style of the text, the luxurious gifts, the animals, the shields depicting the victories of Charles V (1519-1556), the father of Philip II showed effectively how rich an ally Philip had and that he had a network of allies and dependents all over the world. Interestingly, Weinsberg has nothing to say about the letter and the gifts themselves, maybe he thought that the strange text and gifts speak for themselves.

Weinsberg frequently used letters to write up his diary. For example, one of his sources on the Spanish Armada was a pamphlet consisting of three letters. Weinsberg also copied the correspondence between the Duke of Parma and the mayor of Antwerp before the
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213 ibid.
215 W D 281r, 1 September 1592.
216 For instance “nachdem er den friden mit uns” instead “nachdem er mit uns den friden, “armaden” helyett “armada,” substituting “König von Hispanien.” with “Philipp,” etc.
218 W D 62v, 12 August 1588.
city’s surrender in 1585. The reason for it was partly that many early modern news publications imitated the epistolary form, one of the traditional forms of getting information. “Medieval epistolary rhetoric … was the genre ancestor of the news pamphlet.” By the sixteenth century one of the most frequent forms of reporting news was the printed letter. The epistolary form lent credibility and authenticity to the news reported, “claiming to offer intimate, first-hand accounts.” If one of the important participants recounted the events, almost as an eyewitness, then it was considered to be even more credible. For instance, in 1588 Weinsberg emphasised that the Duke of Guise (1550-1588) “himself recounted” the events of the Day of the Barricades in a publication Weinsberg got access to. Weinsberg preferred eyewitness testimonies in the case of oral news, too. Furthermore, keeping the letter’s original first person transforms copying the letter to a direct quotation, which was almost guarantee of authenticity.

There were other genres which Weinsberg tended to copy word for word, most importantly legal documents, both private and public. For instance, he copied word for word a proposal submitted to the city council when he was a member of the council with its complete title, subtitles and submission date. He also copied the printed peace proposal of the Spaniards in 1579, when the negotiations between the Spanish and the Dutch were held in Cologne: he copied entire paragraphs with their numbering. In case of an agreement on the

219 W S 476v, 13 November 1584.
225 W D 40v, 12 May 1588.
226 Schnurr, Religionskonflikt, 472-473.
228 W I 622v, 23 September 1572.
229 W S 129r, 1 June 1579.
occupation of Antwerp he even copied the names of the signatories.\textsuperscript{230} As noted above, newswriters also tended to print official publications and correspondence verbatim, partly as a proof of authenticity and reliability of their pamphlets, partly maybe as an acknowledgement of the importance of these kinds of documents and partly maybe as a result of respecting authorities.\textsuperscript{231}

Weinsberg also copied the name of the printer and the place of the publication from the end of the newsletter as he frequently did in case of other printed materials, too.\textsuperscript{232} However, in this case he seems to be somewhat dissatisfied that there was no publication date on the newsletter. He would have desired the full date, even the day of the publication to be printed,\textsuperscript{233} together with the place of publication and imprint.\textsuperscript{234} Proper dating and imprint were important for him to evaluate the credibility of his sources.

On the other hand, Weinsberg almost never copied the titles of his printed news materials.\textsuperscript{235} He usually referred to the different genres of \textit{Neue Zeitungen}, \textit{Flugblätter}, and \textit{Flugschriften} as simply “printed news.” The reason for it may be that the titles of these publications were usually merely \textit{Zeitung} [news], \textit{Wahrhaftige Zeitung} [veritable news], \textit{Neue Zeitung} [new news] or something similar. Probably Weinsberg did not regard these titles as proper ones although the function of them was important on the news market in convincing prospective buyers, that the publications bearing these titles were newsworthy and credible, that it is worth spending money on them.

\textsuperscript{230} W S 520r, 17 August 1585.
\textsuperscript{231} M3, 1; M3, 4.
\textsuperscript{232} W D 54v, 21 July 1588.
\textsuperscript{233} W S 513r, 19 July 1585.
\textsuperscript{234} W D 55r, 21 July 1588.
\textsuperscript{235} On imprints, titles and other editorials see Smith Helen and Louise Wilson, eds., \textit{Renaissance Paratexts} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Weinsberg’s only comment to the letter and the list of gifts is that he leaves this whole issue to God, who knows the reasons of it best—236—but it is also basically the copy of the text of the newsletter. Early modern newsletters frequently finished with forward-looking expressions, such as “what is com to passe betwixt both we shal shortly heare”237 or “what the issue will be, time can reveale,”238 in order to persuade the readers to buy the next publication of the printer, in which the following events would be revealed.239 Weinsberg also usually finished his diary entries with similar closing sentences, thus formally following the practice of the newswriters. However, in this particular case he did not copy the very last half sentence of the newsletter, which is the addition of the newswriter to the letter of the Sultan and which expresses the hope that God will not abandon Christianity, thus giving a prayer-like closing to the newsletter.

To sum up, some of Weinsberg’s methods and approaches were similar to that of the newswriters. There were certain genres (correspondence, official documents, etc.) which he found important enough to copy verbatim and he paid particular attention to those details of his printed materials which lent credibility to these sources (dating, imprint, intitulatio, etc), to make sure that he himself provided veritable and reliable accounts of news to the readers of his diary.

As noted above, Weinsberg clearly distinguished between the different methods he applied when writing his diary. The next chapter will discuss a case when he chose a slightly more complicated method than simply copying.

236 W S 513v, 19 July 1585.
238 ibid.
239 ibid.
Chapter IV. The Muster of the Spanish Armada (1588)

The campaign of the Spanish Armada against England in 1588 was not only fought at sea but it was also surrounded by a propaganda war between the English and Spanish sides. One of the many pertinent contemporary publications is a description of the Armada. It is an official report in Spanish on the strength of the Armada published in May 1588 before the deployment of the fleet from Lisbon. The aim of the publication most probably was “to frighten England by the display of strength,” to intimidate the English. It was rapidly translated into different languages. There were two printed versions of the report available in Cologne in the early days of August 1588. The slightly shorter version was the work of Nikolaus Schreiber and the second was translated by Aitzing. Weinsberg chose Aitzing’s version to insert into his diary.

240 Betrand T. Whitehead, Brags and Boasts: Propaganda in the Year of the Armada, 1588 (Stroud: Sutton, 1994).
Weinsberg followed the development of the conflict between England and Spain with great interest. The first information about the Armada reached him on 10 July 1588. He reported from printed news that a huge fleet was set up by Philip II. This fleet set sail on 30 May from Lisbon and arrived in La Coruña on 19 June. Consequently, this was not fresh news even in the terms of the contemporaries and Weinsberg noted in his diary that these events had happened weeks earlier. Weinsberg also added, that in the meantime the English were also preparing for the war and that allegedly Philipp II had been wanting to conquest the non-Catholic England and Holland since years, following the advice and command of the Pope. However, other countries did not like the idea of uniting so many kingdoms under one ruler.

Weinsberg’s next diary entry contains the description of the muster of the Armada, dated to 28 July. By that time the fleet was already in the English Chanel, engaged in heavy fighting. The decisive battle, the Battle of Gravelines took place on the following day (29 July). At the beginning of the diary entry, Weinsberg mentioned that on this day the news about the Armada—that is the description itself—arrived and those who supported the Spanish rejoiced hearing the news. The diarist stated that this printed news was translated to German by a certain Michael von Aitzing, who published it under his name and who claimed that it followed the Spanish original exactly. Thus Weinsberg in this case too copied the imprint with the publisher’s claim of being trustworthy, at the same time proving that he, Weinsberg himself used trustworthy sources to compose his diary entry.

Weinsberg’s text provides insight into the way he reviewed news pieces before recording them. The diarist summarised the content of the pamphlet by copying the title from

---

244 W D 53r, 10 July 1588.
245 Fort he timeline of the events see Martin and Parker, The Spanish Armada, xix.
246 W D 53r, 10 July 1588.
247 W D 56v, 28 July 1588.
the third page. This passage shows certain signs that he had read or at least scanned through the pamphlet before copying as he included information not included in the pamphlet. For example, he seems to know that the words urcas, zabras, patasches, etc. in the title of the pamphlet mean different types of ships.\textsuperscript{248} He also knows that the Armada consisted of ships from different countries, although this information is not explained in the title but appears later in the pamphlet (page 16). Weinsberg also added that the pamphlet would contain data about the cannon balls and the clergy travelling with the Armada as well.

After this, Weinsberg showed his skill as an editor and explained that the author of the pamphlet established ten chapters, in which he named every ship with its captains and gave details regarding their weight and load. Since it would have been too boring to write all these down, Weinsberg decided to record the cumulative data only.\textsuperscript{249} The original pamphlet is thirty-two page long, but the diarist wrote a four page summary. Despite this abbreviation with its four pages it is still among the longest entries of the diary which shows how interested Weinsberg was in the event.

The fact that Weinsberg not only abridged the text but also modified the structure and headings shows that he tailored the text to his own purposes by subtle manipulation. The most obvious difference between the printed translation and Weinsberg’s version is that the pamphlet is divided into chapters with chapter headings, whereas Weinsberg writes mostly continuously. In most cases each chapter is summarised in one corresponding paragraph in the diary. There are few cases when the diarist merged two chapters into one paragraph, for instance, the chapters about the volunteers and those who were paid by the king. On the other hand toward the end of his diary entry Weinsberg created independent chapters with headings

\textsuperscript{248} \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{249} W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
out of a continuous passage of the pamphlet. To connect the paragraphs he usually simply used the word *item*.

Besides the abridgement and modified paragraphing, Weinsberg applied other means of emphasis and guidance. For example, he frequently employed marginalia showing the main point of the paragraph, such as “about the enormous Armada from Spain,” “Admiral Medina Sidonia,” and so on.\(^{250}\) In the list of the parts of the fleet he added numbers in front of the paragraphs and indicated the origin of each part of the fleet in the margins, except for groups 7 and 8, where the logic of the original changes abandoning the geographical order according to the ships’ origin for ordering them by ship size. In group 9 the pamphlet’s geographical organization resumes and Weinsberg added a marginal note but did not do so for group 10, probably because he already labelled one paragraph as “Portugal.” The consistent marginalia suggest that Weinsberg was quite systematic and noticed the changes in the composition of the text.

Further down Weinsberg’s marginal notes are about the types of people (for instance volunteers, medical staff, clerics, etc.) or objects (provision, equipment, etc.) grouped together in the pamphlet. In most of the cases Weinsberg formulated his marginal notes from the chapter headings, except for the first three notes where he highlighted the main points of the headline of the pamphlet, namely that it describes the enormous Spanish Armada as well as the names and number of ships. Sometimes he drew together several chapter headings into one single marginal note.

In the first part of the pamphlet, which contains information about the fleet itself, for each part of the fleet Weinsberg first recorded the heading of the chapters containing the

origin of the ships and the name of the captain. Then he copied the cumulative number of ships from the end of the chapter adding the names of all ships from the beginning of the chapter—but merely their names, not the details, as he promised. Then he continued with the cumulative data of the fleet, mentioning the cumulative weight of the ships as well as the number of soldiers, sailors and cannons. He described all ten parts of the fleet exactly in this way. He clearly had a plan or strategy about what to copy and what not before actually starting to copy and applied his plan consistently.

He copied the names of almost all of the ships omitting only two: once in the case of the fleet from Guipúzcoa and once in the case of the four galleys from Portugal where three ships are mentioned in the same line in the pamphlet and he recorded only the first one. Both omissions, which are typical mistakes of copying seem to be accidental ones. Although Cologne was a major inland port and water transport played an important role both in the life of the city and especially in the activities of merchants (including Weinsberg himself, who frequently travelled by ship\textsuperscript{251}), these names probably did not mean anything to Weinsberg.\textsuperscript{252} This makes his obsession with ships rather strange, especially since—as it will be shown later—he copied hardly any personal names from the later passages of the pamphlet.

The fact, that Weinsberg merely copied the cumulative data suggests that he probably did not really understand the importance of the size of these ships, namely that these were enormous vessels, many of them weighed over 1000 tons. To compare, Francis Drake’s famous ship, the \textit{Golden Hind} weighed about 100 tons. To emphasise the size of the ships was probably one of the most important aims of this official Spanish publication and effectively contributed to the image of the “invincible” Armada. There is also at least one

\textsuperscript{252} Leonard Ennen, \textit{Die alte und die neue Stadt Köln} (Cologne: DuMont-Schauberg, 1876), 2-3.
ship from Germany (barca de Amburg) but Weinsberg had nothing to say about the German participation in the campaign. 253

As for his stylistic intervention during the transference of the text from print to handwritten copy, similarly to the case of the Sultan’s letter, when he decided to copy something, he did so almost word for word, for example, changing only the conjunctions. 254 Even in the case of less important points he tended to copy the original wording of the pamphlet almost verbatim 255 and only occasionally made minor changes. 256

However, he frequently made stylistic changes in order to shorten the text by omitting words which seemed to be synonyms or tautologies for him. For example, instead of “soldiers, infantry” he only copied “soldiers,” 257 instead of “armada or armament of the galleons from Castile” he simply wrote “armada from Castile.” 258 If he could choose, he chose the German version of names, for example the expression Nuestra Senora, das ist, Unser Fraw is shortened to Unser Fraw. He frequently skipped details with no exact data (as in the case of the fleet from Castile) or those he considered to be passing remarks in the original. 259 On the other hand, he also skipped details which seemed to be too detailed, for example instead of the pamphlet’s description on the gunpowder, lead and ropes carried by the ships, 260 he merely wrote “with all other weapons and equipment.” 261 He also usually

254 E.g. where the pamphlet says “Inhalt, begriff oder anzahl der Galeonen auß Portugal,” Weinsberg copied it as “Inhalt, begrif und anzal der galeonen auß Portugall.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
255 For instance, he finished one paragraph with the clause “und waß ferner dar zu gehoorich” originally phrased as “unnd was verrer darzu gehörig” in the pamphlet. W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
256 For example, instead of “Schiffleuten” he wrote “schifffolck,” or slightly changed the word order: instead of “auß dem Landt von Gipuzcoa” he wrote “auß Gipuzcoa dem lant.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
257 “Soldaten, Fußvolck” and “Soldanten,” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
258 “Armada oder Kriegsrüstung der Galeonen auß Castilia” and “armada auß Castilia.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
259 For instance, “als Kugel / Puluer / Bley und Lundten / etc.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
261 “mit aller ander rustung und zubehuir,” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
omitted the statements that the captains of the fleets were appointed by the king, probably because it seemed obvious to him.

At the end of this detailed description of the fleet, there is a lengthy summary in the pamphlet which is basically a repetition of the cumulative data from the end of each chapter. Weinsberg noticed this, omitted this part entirely and recorded merely the division and the total number of the ships. But since it is a summarizing chapter, he copied it in detail. Weinsberg not only copied the “topic sentence,” which contains the main information about the content of this paragraph verbatim, but basically copied the entire paragraph omitting only the repetitions.

The second part of the pamphlet contains details regarding the army. Since the campaign against England was considered to be a crusade by the Spanish king, many nobles volunteered to participate. To stress this, the pamphlet contains long lists with the names of the volunteers. Here Weinsberg also followed the chapter headings quite closely, but omitted superfluous information. In contrast to his practice of recording the names of the ships, Weinsberg did not copy personal names and merely mentioned that there were dukes, margraves and counts among the volunteers and they came from various places. He added that they all were named in the pamphlet but it would be too long to copy all of them. At the same time, he still followed the text of the pamphlet closely, for example, he mentioned twice that these volunteers were not paid by the king, which information was also repeated in the

262 “Aber die gattung oder sorten der schiff die bei der von armada sin” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
263 For example, instead of “Uber disse erzelten 130 Schiff komen auch mit 20 kleine schifflin die man Carauellas heist” he wrote “Uber disse komen noch 20 kleine schifflin genent cravellas.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
264 For instance, he had “Nu folgen die aventureros, das sin die uff iren eigen kosten sampt iren dienern mitzehen” instead of “Nun folgen die aventureros, daß ist die so auff ihren eigen Costen mit ziehen kommen mit dierser Armada sambt ire Diener so sie mitbringen.” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
265 In the above instance “mit dieser Armada” and “so sie mitbringen.”
original text at the beginning and at the end of the chapter.\textsuperscript{266} This repetition may have been a lapse of attention during the tedious work of copying. He commented that the reasons of the volunteers to join the Armada must have been devotion or honour or wanting to prove themselves. He similarly did not copy the names of the mercenary captains and officers because they were unknown people in Germany anyway. He noticed that from this point on not everyone was mentioned by name in the description of the lesser officers in the pamphlet, but merely by their professions and offices.\textsuperscript{267} Consequently, from this point on Weinsberg also began registering the different professions and functions. For instance, about medical staff he mentioned that there were surgeons and apothecaries among them. About clerics he noted the different orders they belonged to and mentioned that they came from different countries. Although they were named in the original, he was not interested in the officials’ names either, recording only their function such as paymasters, scribes, judges, prison warders, and so on. But in all cases he mentioned the cumulative number of persons.

At the same time, in the description of the military units\textsuperscript{268} Weinsberg again recorded the names (and only that) of the most eminent noble captains. Regarding the other members he mentioned that they were also named in the pamphlet and about the Sicilian regiment he even speculated that they must have been from Italy—although judging from their family names (Juarez, Herrera, etc.) in the pamphlet they were probably not. On the other hand, he failed to notice that there were many English among the volunteers. He clearly read the whole text before selecting the parts to record, for example, at one point he wrote \textit{Compania oder nuw. bende sueltas}\textsuperscript{269} to disambiguate the term \textit{compania} which appeared only later in the

\begin{flushleft} 
\textsuperscript{266} “Nu folgen die aventureros, das sin die uff iren eigen kosten sampt iren dienern mitzehen … Summa der principaler herrn so uff iren eigen zolt kommen sin” W D 57r, 28 July 1588.
\textsuperscript{267} “Item folgen die zum geschutz verordnet sin und zum theil benent mit iren officien und ampten” W D 57v, 28 July 1588.
\textsuperscript{268} “regiment” W D 57v, 28 July 1588.
\textsuperscript{269} W D 57v, 28 July 1588. 
\end{flushleft}
original pamphlet. Finally, Weinsberg copied the total number of all the participants of the campaign (*Summa summarum*), which ended the second part of the pamphlet.

The third part of the pamphlet is about the provision, supply and equipment of the Armada. Weinsberg recorded the amount of all foodstuffs mentioned in the pamphlet with the only additions that the water carried is “sweet” water, probably to tailor the text to his German audience. As before, it is apparent that Weinsberg had read the text before copying, since the original chapter heading in the pamphlet does not mention “drink” and that the food supply is enough for six months, but Weinsberg inserts this information into his own heading. At the same time, he omitted the comments of the pamphlet which were probably the most important for the original publishers, namely that these rations were more than sufficient to supply the whole army for six months. More interestingly, he did not completely understand the text. For instance, he wrote that everyone was given half a quintal of bread every month, although the original text stated that calculating with half a quintal per person per month the amount of bread is sufficient for more than six months.

Recording the weapons and equipment carried with the Armada, Weinsberg created three chapters. He mentioned some items of the equipment: mostly objects, such as drinking vessels and leadware. There were carriages for the planned land invasion and many crucifixes. However, Weinsberg neglected the details (for example, that the drinking vessels are made of wood), simplified the original description (instead of “plates or *laminae* of lead” he merely writes “all kinds of leadware”) and omitted the explanations, for example, that these lead plates were for mending eventual leaking. He mentioned the 5000 pairs of shoes but omitted the Spanish term for these shoes; copied the passage about the different types of

---

270 *ibid.*
weapons as well as their numbers in detail, but again omitted the explanations provided by
the translator who apparently struggled to translate the special words of weapons (and shoes)
into German.

Furthermore, there is a two-line poem in Latin at the very end of the pamphlet.\textsuperscript{272} The
fact that it was not translated into German is an indicator that the target audience of the
pamphlet was the educated elite to which Weinsberg himself belonged.\textsuperscript{273} Since it is so
different from the earlier parts of the catalogue, Weinsberg expressed his doubts whether it
was in the original or it was the addition of the translator. In any case, Weinsberg copied it
word for word into his diary, in Latin, which means that he indeed understood it and expected
his readers to do so too. Strangely enough, while he did not copy the title of the poem—
which addresses the English and their allies,\textsuperscript{274}—he did muse about its meaning and intended
audience, whether they were the party of the Guise brothers or the Calvinists, or maybe
Holland or France. Although he recorded that people in Cologne firmly believed that this
poem was about England, he was not completely convinced.\textsuperscript{275} This suggests that he
understood the Latin words but not the overall meaning of the poem, namely that it was
meant to be a warning to England. The distich reminded Weinsberg of the fall of the big
dynasties in history and to the allmightiness of God which thoughts made him rewrite the
lines.\textsuperscript{276} After explaining the changes he made to the poem, he added that allegedly there was
a holy league formed between the Pope, the Emperor and other Catholic rulers to enforce the

\textsuperscript{272} “Tu, quae Romanas voluisti spermere leges, / Hispano discis subdere colla iugo. [You, who wanted to despise
Roman laws / You will learn to submit your neck to the Spanish yoke.]” Aitzing, \textit{Warhaffte Relation}, C4v and
W D 58r, 28 July 1588.

\textsuperscript{273} Weinsberg frequently copied the poems printed under the engravings of topical news no matter whether he
bought the engraving or merely saw them. As noted above, in the case of the engraving on the Junkersdorf
massacre, which was prohibited to sell, he was eager to record at least the poem attached to the engraving (W S
586v, 15 July 1586). He copied the poems attached to engravings on the siege of Bonn in 1587 (W S 693r, 29
December 1587), on the funeral of Johann Baptista von Taxis (W D 33v, 20 April 1588), on the Spanish
Armada (W D 63v, 12 August 1588), on the assassination of the Guise brothers (W D 94v, 23 December 1588),
and on the occupation of Groningen (W D 371v, 22 July 1594) as well.

\textsuperscript{274} “Ad anglam et eius asseclas europae” Aitzing, \textit{Warhaffte Relation}, C4v.

\textsuperscript{275} W D 58r, 28 July 1588.

\textsuperscript{276} “Tu, quae romanas voluisti extollere vires, / Fortunam discis posse juvare reos. [You, who wanted to raise
Roman forces / You will teach Fortune how to help sinners.]” W D 58r, 28 July 1588.
decrees of the Council of Trent and now they wanted to force those who resisted to their side. This creative editorial control over the poem and the associated explanatory passages reveal that he saw this military campaign as part of international politics, not merely a conflict between England and Spain and he was aware of the importance of the conflict.

Regarding the numbers, as he stated at the beginning, he indeed usually registered the cumulative data only. Weinsberg copied the figures very carefully albeit sometimes failed to notice or note miscalculations in the pamphlet. 277 His editorial interventions include conscious efforts to make his copy easier to understand, for example in the case of provision he made tables from the numerical data which were given in sentences in the pamphlet. His editorial practice was clearly informed by his professional practice: he converted the text to the same table format in which he kept all of his own inventories of food and other supplies, as well as financial accounts. Although Walter J. Ong connects the spread of charts and tables with that of printing, 278 in this case the manuscript version is the one, which should be “visually assimilated,” 279 whereas the print version with its long sentences is closer to orality.

To sum up Weinsberg’s copying techniques and strategies, we can safely conclude that he copied the text painstakingly and attentively. There are few accidental omissions and incorrect numbers. 280 He typically copied one thing after the other from the original text and faithfully followed the text of the pamphlet. He rarely changed the sequence of the information and even then merely in minor details. The most significant change he made is

---

277 For instance, in the case of the fleet of the urcas there were merely 19 ships mentioned although their overall number was stated to be 23. Aitzing, Warhaffte Relation, A8v.
279 ibid.
280 For instance, the total weight of the fleet from Andalusia is 8762 tons in the pamphlet and 8702 in the diary; the amount of the vinegar is 23870 arrobas in the pamphlet and 3870 in the diary. Most importantly Weinsberg misread the total sum (summa summarum) of the number of participants: he wrote 23687, whereas the pamphlet claims that there were 28687 participants.
the rearrangement of the numbers into table form and turning chapter headings into marginalia.

His individual interest lies in the selection of the details, which can be inferred because he frequently omitted and skipped parts of the text. It is evident that he was mostly interested in concrete data and facts whereas he usually skipped explanations and extensions. His own voice can be heard at the beginning and at the end of the diary entry. However, he sometimes did not understand some sentences or subtle meanings suggested by the author of the pamphlet and which were clearly conveyed by the German translation too.

As demonstrated above, he not merely read the pamphlet, but probably read it through thoroughly more than once, although he did not mention that he had bought it. He could have borrowed it for some time or consulted it in someone’s study in a series of visits. Whether or not it was his copy, however, it is absolutely certain that a copy of the pamphlet was in front of him while copying. The overall picture of his even handwriting also shows that he was not in a hurry. The quality may also suggest that he copied it relatively uninterrupted in a quiet place, probably in his upstairs study at Haus Cronenberg.281

The official list of the ships, soldiers and equipment of the Armada is a rather tedious text. Even Weinsberg recognized this when he wrote that he abridged it because he did not want to be too boring.282 But this raises the question why he undertook the task of copying it at all. The answer may partly that it was translated by someone from Cologne, which he specifically stressed in the introductory notes.

281 Lundin, Paper Memory, 231.
282 However, Weinsberg frequently copied lists into his diary. For instance, there is another list of the popes from St Peter to Clement VIII, which is probably a copy of a catalogue (W D 481r-486r, 30 September 1595). Once he started to copy the catalogue of the Frankfurt Book Fair: he copied ten items (mainly dealing with topical issues) out of the 317 titles (W S 571v, 20 April 1586). To this genre of lists see Lucie Dořezalová, ed., The Charm of a List: From the Sumerians to Computerised Data Processing (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).
But maybe there are other explanations as well. Today these numbers and data would be considered as highly classified military secrets. Probably Weinsberg felt that he had access to some really confidential, top secret news. Another reason could be that the list resembled the famous Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad* which was well known probably for everyone educated. However, his main reason was that he considered this fleet because of its dimensions to be a curiosity, a “wonder.”

“Since I have never learned or heard about a greater armada on the ocean or on sea in my time, I could not skip to display this war preparation as a wonder, since it seems to the human sense that no king, prince of lord could resist this armada with equal force and power.”


285 “Nachdem ich bei miner zeit von groisser armada uff der oceanischer oder see nehe vernomen oder gehoirt hab, kunt ich diß kreichsrustung vor ein wonder anzuzeigen nit underlaissen, das es scheint menschlicher weiß daß kein koninck, furst, oder her disser armada mit glicher gwalt und macht mogt widder stain.” W D 58r, 28 July 1588.
Chapter V. The Assassination of the French King
Henry III (1589)

The following two chapters will show how Weinsberg summarized the news of the assassination of the French King Henry III. The regicide followed years of civil and religious war in France, the so-called War of the Three Henrys. During the uprising of the Day of the Barricades in 1588 Henry III was expelled from Paris. For revenge, Henry III had killed the Guise brothers, the leaders of the Catholic League in Blois and planned to retake the capital. He set up his camp at Saint-Cloud and started to besiege Paris at the end of July 1589. The Parisians, in their desperate situation, instigated a young Dominican friar to kill the king. Jacques Clément (1567-1589) stabbed Henry III to death on 1 August 1589, and the king died on the next day.

The Pamphlet on the Assassination

As demonstrated above, Weinsberg was very well informed about the political and military events throughout Europe and he was able to see the different developments in contexts of international relations. He also followed closely the events of the French civil war with great interest. For instance, he knew about the fact that in France three parties were fighting against each other. He recorded in his diary the Day of the Barricades, the assassination of the

288 W D 40v, 12 May 1588.
Guise brothers in Blois, the death of Catherine de’ Medici (1519-1589), the decree of the University of Paris against the king, and other events of similar importance—although the alliance by Henry III and Henry of Navarre in April 1589 reached him only at the end of September, when Henry III was already dead.

His major sources of information from France were not always printed news. As mentioned above, his nephew, who lived in Strasbourg, furnished him with information from France in his letters. In the case of the assassination of the Guise brothers Weinsberg stated that the news reached him in several letters. He did not mention any printed source in his diary regarding this murder other than an engraving with a poem, which he copied into his diary.

The sensational news of the regicide arrived in Cologne within days and Weinsberg dealt with it several times in his diary. In this case too, at first Weinsberg did not have any printed news concerning the assassination. He first mentioned the murder in an entry dated to 1 August, the alleged day of the death of the king. The diarist summarized the events in a fairly detailed way and more or less correctly, except for the claim that the king had lived on for five more days. Weinsberg added that this news arrived “early” in Cologne but the city council decided to prohibit the printing the news.

Although Weinsberg did not have printed source, he still decided to record the murder after the “common news” since it was much talked about for a long time. He almost excuses himself in his diary for writing about it from uncertain sources, similarly to the case
of the murder of the Guises in Blois. In this latter case he explained that he dared to record it since the news arrived continuously and there was no other news which contradicted it. However, it is noteworthy, that he did not forget to mention his sources. In addition, Weinsberg summarized the life of the deceased king and added that this was what he wanted to write for the time being until he would receive some “proper” information because he knew very well that the French Catholics and Protestants tended to disseminate lies about each other.

Weinsberg returned to the topic at the end of August when he bought two engravings which depicted the murder and which will be dealt with in the following chapter. He described both engravings in details and added that he was still unable to get any printed publication on the murder but promised to continue his account if some news would arrive. His promise is similar to that of the news writers, who wanted to maintain the interest in their publications. But Weinsberg’s promise also sheds light on the phenomenon that practically there was no continuous flow of news. It seems rather accidental when Weinsberg managed to get some news and when not and it probably seemed so for him too. Printed news was “sporadic and unpredictable, appearing when an enterprising printer happened to come across a bit of information that seemed marketable.” In the meantime Weinsberg recorded mostly news which were seemingly unrelated to the events in France, for instance about
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Maarten Schenck’s (c.1540-1589) attack on Nijmegen, and four days later that the body of Schenck—who got drowned in the meantime—was quartered.

Two days after buying the engravings, on 30 August Weinsberg got fresh information of an alleged battle in France, which was probably fake news. No wonder that Weinsberg commented that the news arriving from France was “weird” and unreliable as usual and he still had to rely on oral sources only. According to Weinsberg, people say that the late king handed over the kingdom to Henry of Navarre as his closest kin on condition that he becomes Catholic. However, Henry of Navarre was still excommunicated and Paris did not recognize him, but the Duke of Mayenne (1554-1611) as the new king. The following pieces of news in the diary are also unrelated to the events in France: they are about Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, who was released from his captivity in Poland and about events in Bonn.

Finally, on 26 September, almost two months after the murder, Weinsberg wrote a long summary of the events with the remark that “it was only possible to get it now,” that is, to get printed news. In this diary entry he summarized the content of a pamphlet. Based on the Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts (VD 16) at least twenty-eight pamphlets were published about the assassination in 1589 in German. The pamphlet which resembles most what is written in the diary is titled Wahrhaffter und Gruendlicher Bericht Wie Henricus dieses Namens der dritte ... erstochen worden. This publication is a compilation of many separate texts. It contains a description

---
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312 Anon., Wahrhaffter und Gruendlicher Bericht Wie Henricus dieses Namens der dritte Koenig in Franckreich von einem Prediger Muench zu S.Claud den 1.Tag August. Anno 89. mit einem kleinen vergifften Messerlein in
of the murder and into this narrative are inserted some other texts: the letter of the dying king recounting his assassination, the oath of Henry IV, and the oath of the noblemen to the new ruler. To the end of the publication another text is attached, which is allegedly a copy of printed news distributed by the Catholics in Antwerp. Some parts of the pamphlet are more similar to the text of the diary, some less.

The passage which suggests that Weinsberg followed the text of the above-mentioned pamphlet starts when Jacques Clément is introduced. The text of the diary is much shorter than the pamphlet, which means that Weinsberg again—as in the case of the pamphlet on the Armada—abridged his source. Weinsberg duly recorded all the factual details: the name, age, place of birth of the murderer and even the distance between the friar’s place of birth and the nearest town as well as the religious order he belonged to. These biographical details are given in all pamphlets dealing with the assassination, so these were probably considered to be essential parts of news reporting by contemporaries. Weinberg also frequently recorded these kinds of details. For example, after Gregory XIV (1590-1591) was elected Pope in 1590, Weinsberg gave an account of his former life, his age, and so on.\textsuperscript{313} Weinsberg also expected his sources to provide him with these details. Writing about the assassination attempt against Henry IV in 1594 he complained that there was nothing known about the murderer himself, for instance about his occupation or who his parents were.\textsuperscript{314}

In the following paragraphs Weinsberg also paid special attention to the factual information: he recorded the exact date—even the hour—when Clément arrived at the king’s camp, adding that this date was given in the pamphlet according to the newly introduced
Gregorian calendar. But he omitted that the friar departed from Paris, probably because he had already stated that the Parisians wanted the death of the king.

Weinsberg omitted several other parts, too, for varied reasons. For instance, he preferred contracting suggestive language. Instead of “pretending as” he merely wrote “as,” instead of “the king’s majesty” he wrote “the king,” or omitted a linking half sentence which merely stated that “in order to put his intention the sooner in action.”

Weinsberg did not like repetitions either. For example, after recording that the friar’s intention was to pretend that he was commissioned by the president of the parliament to talk to the king secretly about some confidential issues, he omitted to mention that Clément told the king that he had been commissioned by the president to talk to him secretly, since the text of the pamphlet basically repeated the same information twice. Avoiding superfluous words and repetition was required from professional newswriters as well. Finally, Weinsberg also omitted attributes like “desperate” and strong critical remarks, for instance that Clément paid reverence to the king “like Judas,” albeit the gesture of paying reverence was important enough for him to mention it in his diary.

In similar vein, Weinsberg also tended to simplify: he used much shorter sentences than the pamphlet, which has eight or nine line paragraphs each consisting of one single sentence, maybe as precursors of the Baroque literary style. Weinsberg used less passive

---

315 W D 143v, 26 September 1589 and Anon, Wahrhaffter vnd Gruendlicher, A4v. Similarly, Weinsberg also deems it superfluous to report that Clément was led in front of Henry III by the chief officers of the king (Anon, Wahrhaffter vnd Gruendlicher, Br). Elsewhere, instead of “tumult and riot” he merely wrote that “riot” broke out in the camp at the news of the murder and did not mention that “among the soldiers” probably because it was obvious for him in the case of a military camp (W D 143v, 26 September 1589 and Anon, Wahrhaffter vnd Gruendlicher, Bv). In another instance, he cut the passage which explains that the president, whose letters the friar brought to the king as an excuse to meet the king, was held as prisoner in Paris by the League. He merely mentions that he was held as prisoner in Paris (W D 143v, 26 September 1589 and Anon, Wahrhaffter vnd Gruendlicher, A4v).
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structures: instead of the president “was held prisoner” he wrote “they [Parisians] kept him” prisoner. Instead of “when the Almighty God would demand him out of this cumbersome life” he simply wrote “as soon as he would be dead” and instead of “as the hour of his departure drew a little closer” he decided to write “as death drew closer,” thus altering the elevated tone of the original text of the pamphlet to a more everyday one. Moreover, Weinsberg tended to use simple linking words, such as “and” between his clauses and sentences, which gives a “flavour or orality” to his written reports:

“At the beginning it is told how those of Guise from their beginning and for a long time strived for the king’s crown, body and life and undertook to take over royal government and power themselves. The king was warned about this in many ways and he also felt that he should curtail out of the greatest necessity the one of Guise together with his brother the cardinal. And the Guiseists from that day on oddly raged and gossiped how they even wanted to assassinate the king. The king (who was aware of this) strengthened and furnished himself, occupied several towns and fortresses and went to war and had his camp at Saint Claude.”

At the same time, Weinsberg copied almost word for word the murder itself: how the friar drew his knife out while the king was reading the letters and how the friar stabbed the knife into the king half a finger deep. Clearly this was the most dramatic, most important part
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of the pamphlet for him. The murder itself and the agony of the victim are described at length and in great detail both in the diary and in the pamphlet. This part of his diary entry resembles the very popular genre of crime pamphlets, which aimed to entertain its readership with some horror.\textsuperscript{325}

Weinsberg quoted in direct speech what the king shouted at the monk when he recognized the situation. Quoting someone in direct speech obviously has a strong emotional and dramatic impact on the reader.\textsuperscript{326} However, Weinsberg made his narrative even more dramatic with substituting the pamphlet’s original sentence (“What are you doing?”) with a more theatrical exclamation (“Do you want to kill me?”).\textsuperscript{327} This is an example of the very few exclamations in the text of the diary. Weinsberg usually described his news using declarative sentences packed with nouns and verbs.\textsuperscript{328} On the other hand Weinsberg hardly applied rhetoric devices, such as similes and metaphors. He had no ambition to be poetic—his “unadorned style” of reporting news is exactly what was expected from professional newswriters.\textsuperscript{329}

In all, Weinsberg’s summaries of the events are clear and comprehensible, succinct and concise, and with this they are quite close to the style of the news pamphlets. His summaries are also similar to the pamphlets since they are both packed with factual information. For instance, Weinsberg usually copied place names precisely since they were important elements to make the recorded news authentic and reliable.

Weinsberg basically faithfully followed the text of the pamphlet, he altered neither the sequence of the events—which is structured chronologically, as it was usual in the case of
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pamphlets and broadsides\textsuperscript{330}—nor the structure of the publication. Weinsberg summarized the content of the inserted documents, too, namely the oath of the new king, in which Henry IV most importantly promised to protect the Catholic religion and the oath of the noblemen to the new king. Weinsberg condensed the two page long oath of the king into one paragraph. In this case too, he omitted many details but kept the first person of the original text starting with “We, Henry IV.”\textsuperscript{331} Weinsberg also copied the oath of the nobles but in a more abridged form, summarizing it into one sentence and not in first person.\textsuperscript{332} It seems as if quoting the words of the ruler was more important for him than that of the noblemen. In both cases Weinsberg recorded the issue date of both charters. This is important, as it shows again, that Weinsberg paid great attention to legal and official documents. While this is not surprising from a trained lawyer, like Weinsberg, news publishers—as shown above—also frequently printed charters and other official documents, which suggests that this approach to legal details was more a genre characteristic than evidence for Weinsberg’s own interest and purpose.

Furthermore, Weinsberg claims that M. de Harlai, whose letters Clément brought to the king as an excuse to meet him was the president of the parliament even though this information appears later in the text of the pamphlet. Some other pieces of information—for instance that the letters were fake and the king first thought that he would recover—are similarly not mentioned in the main text but only in the letter of the dying king. However, Weinsberg weaved them into his narrative. In this case again one can assume that Weinsberg first read the entire pamphlet and decided which parts were important for him and which were not. Probably he felt that the king’s letter—which indeed tells the story again—was a
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mere repetition but these two pieces of additional information in the letter were important enough for Weinsberg to insert them into his main text.

In contrast, Weinsberg decided to summarise the last part of the pamphlet into his diary albeit it is also another report on the same story. This is an attachment at the end of the pamphlet and claims to be the copy of printed news from Antwerp. The approach and tone of this attachment was rather different from that of the other parts of the pamphlet. The first part of the pamphlet accused the Guise brothers of the attempt to overthrow the king and emphasised that this was the reason why Henry III had killed them in Blois. Weinsberg also clearly stated that the king commanded the murder “out of the greatest necessity.” But this attachment at the end of the pamphlet praised the friar and called the deceased king a tyrant. Weinsberg clearly noticed this difference in approach and tone. According to him, this second printed news told the story in more or less the same way as the first one but slightly differently: “In this, the story of the king is told approximately in the same way, but the time is slightly changed saying that he [the king] died at two o’clock at night on August 2 […]” At first Weinsberg recorded the differences between the two versions: he listed the differences in the factual information, such as those regarding the hour of the death and the king’s wounds, showing again that Weinsberg paid much attention to factual details. Then Weinsberg recorded the differences in the approach of the two texts: according to the second report the king was a tyrant, hypocrite and apostate—these attributes are in this order in the printed text—whereas the friar was simple but obliging and definitely pious. This suggests that Weinsberg could make a clear distinction between factual information and the comments and evaluations of the author of the pamphlet, that is between exposition (narrative) and
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334 “Darin wirt daß geschicht von deß konincks ungeferlich uff die selbe meinong erzelt, doch der zit etwaß verendert daß er zu 2 vren in der nacht 2 augusti verstorben sult sin…” W D 144r, 26 September 1589.
argument. This distinction was a basic principle of Renaissance rhetoric. Accordingly, as mentioned above, Weinsberg sometimes omitted remarks which were clearly too one-sided for him, such as the “Judas-like” behaviour of the murderer. Weinsberg also tended to omit the sensational, evaluative or passionate adjectives which appealed to the emotions or aimed to arouse interest.

After this, Weinsberg copied some new information—factual details again—regarding Clément’s previous life and his travel to the king’s camp. However, he did not copy the assassination again or the sentence which clearly states that the assassination was a revenge for the murder of the Guise brothers. At the same time he did include the statement that the corpse of the friar was a sacrifice for the liberation from the tyranny of the late king and also copied the conclusion, that Clément must be considered to be blessed.

Facing these two different approaches, Weinsberg seems to be slightly confused. He was used to the fact that oral news was unreliable and one could hear the same story in dozen variations, but in this case he had to face two pieces of printed news which contradicted each other. Up to this point, he seems to accept the explanation the pamphlet provided, accusing the Guise brothers of their hunger for power, which led to the series of murders, but here he frankly admits that he cannot decide who is right:

“I cannot judge. But Christ says mihi vicidicta et ergo retribva [Vengeance is mine, I will repay]. Whether the king was guilty or not or the friar was commanded by God, who can tell, probably no one.”
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337 “Ich kan nit urtheln. Christus spricht aber mihi vicidicta et ergo retribvam. Der koninck habs verschult oder nit ob eß dem monchen von got befollen sei, wer kan daß sagen gleublich nemanß.” W D 144r, 26 September 1589.
Thus in this case he expressed his own opinion: he quoted Romans 12:19, which claims that God is the only one who can take revenge on someone. Weinsberg added that he was convinced that the Dominican Order would certainly be hated now.\textsuperscript{338} It is more interesting, that Weinsberg tried to find out who was “right,” that is he sought a moral judgement in a clearly political situation. At the same time this pamphlet was a contribution to the ongoing contemporary debate on the rightfulness on tyrannicide,\textsuperscript{339} but Weinsberg had nothing to say about it.

Furthermore, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VII (1312-1313) came to Weinsberg’s mind who, to Weinsberg’s knowledge, was also assassinated by a Dominican friar.\textsuperscript{340} Despite the historical precedent, Weinsberg was shocked that a clergyman could commit such a sin; the fact that the murderer was a priest was what he emphasised in the introduction of the murder episode. Hermann was shocked even in 1595 that such a thing, an assassination committed by a clerk in a religious order could happen.\textsuperscript{341} On the other hand, reporting the next French regicide attempt against Henry IV in 1594 Weinsberg wrote that the fact that these murderers voluntarily risked their life was rather strange,\textsuperscript{342} and he was wondering whether someone commanded them to do so.\textsuperscript{343}

It is clear that Weinsberg did not think that these pamphlets might be propaganda pieces or might be partisan even though the title of the Antwerp pamphlet clearly stated that it
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was “the Catholic” version of the events and Weinsberg knew exactly that Antwerp was occupied by Spanish troops and the Spanish king supported the party of the Guises.\(^{344}\)

As in this case too, Weinsberg usually did not copy the closing parts of his printed materials which were the author’s—sometimes very moralistic—comments or admonitions but substituted them with his own opinion.\(^{345}\) Consequently the structure of his accounts looks very much the same as the structure of his printed news: realistic reportage followed by more personal comments.\(^{346}\)

Importantly, Weinsberg did not compare these different descriptions with the first oral news in his own diary and with the narratives of the images he bought. Instead he described the murder almost entirely for the third time although the story must have been well known to him by that time. One possible explanation is that he thought that this attachment offered a new point of view and was thus worth recording. In doing so he basically did the same as the publisher of the printed publication who attached two versions of the same story together to juxtapose them and to provide different approaches to his audience. As noted above, Aitzing did the same in his *Messrelation* juxtaposing the Spanish and English versions regarding the campaign of the Armada. Alternatively, Weinsberg may have felt that this type of source, namely printed news was the most reliable, valuable and important. After all, he waited two months for them.

As for the afterlife of the episode in printed material, despite the city council’s original prohibition to print anything about the murder, in 1589 two pamphlets were
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eventually published in Cologne by Nikolaus Schreiber, both translated from French.\textsuperscript{347} A description of the assassination also appeared in the year’s \textit{Messrelation}.\textsuperscript{348} The texts of these versions are different. Weinsberg clearly did not use them and he did not indicate that he knew about them. Whether he had access to these or not, this suggest that these versions were either published too late for him to include them into his diary, or he was interested only in the first printed news he could get\textsuperscript{349} or he was more interested in recording printed news arriving from far away than the more easily available news printed in Cologne.

To conclude, Weinsberg abbreviated and simplified the texts he used but his plain style still very much resembled the style of his source materials. He clearly distinguished factual information from the evaluative or persuasive parts of the pamphlets and while paying special attention to the former he tended to skip the latter. This means at the same time that he was not easily persuaded: he had his own opinion and he expressed it freely in his private diary.
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The Image on the Assassination

Weinsberg recalled in his diary on August 28, 1589—almost one month after the regicide—that he had bought two images showing the assassination, which arrived from Frankfurt in Cologne. I have not been able to find the first one but the second is probably the one which can be seen here (Figure 1). By comparing the image and the text of the diary it can probably safely stated that this is the image Weinsberg saw and bought.
Figure 1. Anon. *Discours, wahrhaftige Erzehlung, wie Henricus III., König in Frankreich, von einem Münch, Jacob Clemens genannt, d. 1. Aug. 1589 ist erstochen worden.* Verlegung Petri Cesaree: Basel, 1589 [VD 16 ZV 19129], C3. The arrows show the sequence in which Weinsberg described the image.
In the first place, Weinsberg states that this second image is drawn by another hand and it is more “artistic” than the previous one. The expression “artistic” could mean simply “skilled” as well, but in both cases this probably meant that for Weinsberg the image was of a much better quality than the other.

He described the images as follows:

“The other image seems to be [drawn by] another hand, it was slightly more artistic and it depicts a room. On the one side stands the king reading a letter and a monk, there is a little knife in his hand in front of the king’s stomach and the monk was a bit drunk and attacked and stabbed him in the oriel(?) intentionally and above on a small hill a scaffold can be seen, where he was quartered. On the other side the king lay in bed, and a bishop is standing at his feet with a cross, another person with a burning torch, and a third one with an aspergillum in long garments. Beside the king’s bed stands a bareheaded person in armour and sword. People say that he must be the king of Navarre.

In the background there stand many lords and nobles densely around a table with raised two fingers, underneath there is the corpse and the helmit with the coat of arms with lilies and their escutcheons(?). The lords and nobles around it are all bareheaded but one. This one’s head is covered and he puts his two fingers on a letter that was lying on the corpse. Here and there stand many other persons, commandiers and officers as well.”

---
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Weinsberg added that the various parts of the image were marked with numbers but there were no captions except an inscription at the bottom of the picture, which said that this was how the murder happened and if one wanted to know how the events unfolded and what the numbers meant, one could find them in a small pamphlet titled *Discourse or Story of his Majesty’s Death in 1589*. This means that Weinsberg copied into his diary the advertisement of the printer who wanted to raise interest for his publications and make readers buy his other products as well. Weinsberg used the expression “it is said,” which suggests that people talked about the image and its content. In the next sentence Weinsberg complains that outside this pamphlet he was unable to obtain any other printed news about the assassination—probably because the city council in Cologne prohibited publishing the news on the regicide, as noted above. Although Weinsberg did not copy this pamphlet into his diary, but added a comment that he would write about the murder again if he managed to obtain “better” information. Unfortunately he did not mention what “better” information meant for him or why he rejected this pamphlet but is shows again that he was selective and critical regarding his sources. He also did not have any commentaries on the images—except their quality—he merely described them. At the same time it is notable that he still felt the need to provide a written description instead of keeping the images themselves or attaching them to his diary. This either suggests that Hermann attributed more resilience to the written word or that he intended to store and display the image outside his diary, but at the same time wanted to record the contents of the image therein or simply he could not purchase it, maybe he borrowed it or it was passed on to him for a short time. Although there are some drawings made by Weinsberg himself in the diary, I have not found any printed images attached to it.


352 ibid.
353 W D 133v, 1 August 1589.
Weinsberg described the image starting with the figure of the king and of the monk in the top right corner, numbered 1 and 2, respectively. Then he went towards the middle of the picture (describing the capture of the monk) and then upwards (execution of the monk). After that he jumped to the top left corner of the image, to the deathbed of the king. From there his description proceeds back to the top middle and then downwards describing the crowd in the middle of the bottom of the image.

In fact, as opposed to today’s customary direction reading an image sequence, the narrative of the pamphlet begins with figures 3-5, the persons who let the monk enter the room of Henry III, starting the story on the bottom right and continuing (almost) counter-clockwise.354

Weinsberg basically saw three main parts of the picture, the assassination scene, the deathbed scene and the funeral scene—at least he mentioned twice that he proceeded to another part of the image. In each of these parts he first described the king as the “protagonist,” still alive in the first two parts and dead in the coffin in the third. Importantly, he did not see the image as a whole but applied a “scanning technique” instead: he “focused on individual elements of the scene and moved from one element to another.”355

Weinsberg was interested in the persons and the story depicted and hardly mentioned the environment and the details of the image, such as bed, windows, dogs, and so on. This is all the more noticeable because the image is potentially replete with symbolism. For example, dogs may have been symbols of faithfulness or loyalty. Whether or not these subtleties were

---

354 This counter-clockwise direction was so obvious for Weinsberg that he described the other image he bought also in this way, starting from the top right corner, although the narration of that started in the top left corner. Thus Weinsberg reversed the sequence of the events when describing that image: in his narration the monk first murdered the king and after that took the communion and said farewell to his fellow monks. W D 138v, 28 August 1589.

noticed by him, they escaped his description. Weinsberg’s description of the image was meant to accompany and validate his faithful record of events. In this sense the diary genre seems to govern the content of the description: the plot and the characters are of primary importance.

Headdresses were important signs of a person’s social status in early modern times. Some are straightforward, for example, Weinsberg obviously recognized the bishop from his mitre. Regarding the crowd at the bottom of the image, however, Weinsberg emphasised that there was only one person who was wearing a hat and inferred that he must have been the highest-ranked person in that group. This conclusion is the reason why he described the character’s gestures even though he probably failed to recognize that the person beside the deathbed (no. 15) and the person beside the coffin (no. 24) were the same person, namely the new king, Henry IV. In fact, Weinsberg seemed to be somewhat dubious whether the person beside the king’s bed was indeed the new king as “people say,” probably because the person was depicted bareheaded. Interestingly, Weinsberg also assumed that the monk was drunk, probably because the figure of the monk was clinging to the wall and leaning slightly forward. As previously noted, Hermann did not record objects and structures that were peripheral to the plot. At the same time, he did engage in some interpretive work that went beyond strict description: he noted and interpreted certain symbols in the picture as long as they pertained to the plot or the characters.

As noted previously, the explanation of the numbers in the image can be found in another publication. Engravings and woodcuts were often sold as single sheets, but fortunately this particular sheet came down to us bound together with a pamphlet containing these captions. Comparing the actual captions with Weinsberg’s explanation provides an

---

insight into how much Weinsberg understood from the message the engraver wanted to convey.

The pamphlet contains a continuous narrative of the events starting with the historical background (Day of the Barricades, murder of the Guise brothers, etc.). The numbers found in the image (1-25) are inserted into this continuous text. For example figure no. 3 is Lord Bellegarde, figure no. 4 is Lord de Laquesto and figure no. 5 is the secretary of the king. There are some errors as well, for example no. 1 is missing from the text whereas no. 23 appears twice. Bellegarde and de Laquesto were described by Weinsberg as “and many others” even if they had important roles in the events: they let the monk enter the room of the king thus they could be blamed for the murder.

Figures no. 6-8 show the scene how the monk was captured and actually stabbed to death on the spot and the “execution” was later merely performed on his dead body. Weinsberg was clearly unaware of this twist in the story: he interpreted the scene as the capture of the monk who was later executed at the scaffold. The next three figures (9-11) show that the king is going to his bed accompanied by Bellegarde and the secretary “to have a little rest” (12)—nobody thought at first that the wound was serious. This was the way the engraver intended to lead the viewers’ attention to the next major scene (no. 13: the deathbed of the king), in the top left corner of the image. However, Weinsberg neglected to mention this scene.

Weinsberg neglected the pen and the letter on the table near the bed as well, even if they are also important in the story, since they show that Henry III wrote a letter to the
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357 For instance “nemblich den Herrn von Bellegarde / Nu. 3. vnd den Herrn de Laquesto General Procurator / Nu. 4.” Discours, wahrhaftige Erzählung, A4v.  
358 Discours, wahrhaftige Erzählung, B2v-B3r.  
359 Even Henry of Navarre, the possible heir of the throne wrote that it was a “humbug.” Knecht, Hero or Tyrant?, 303.
noblest princes of the whole Christendom. The copy of this letter is inserted into the pamphlet. The next figure (14) shows a doctor analysing the king’s bloody urine, which made the doctors and the king realize that his injury was fatal. Subsequently, according to the pamphlet, Henry III sent for Henry of Navarre who arrived immediately. Thus whoever suggested Weinsberg that the figure no. 15 was the king of Navarre was right.

There are more subtleties that are missing from Weinsberg’s description owing to his oversight. The next scene (no. 16) shows Henry III confirming Henry of Navarre as his successor and recognizing him as king of France. The dying king is depicted sitting in the bed maybe to emphasise that he was still conscious when he did so. The pamphlet says that the king gave Henry of Navarre “the Golden Fleece” and the image depicts him handing a chain to Henry of Navarre. However, most probably Henry III handed over the chain of the Order of the Holy Spirit, a chivalric order he himself founded. The significance of this particular detail in the image, and perhaps the whole image itself, is that Henry of Navarre was willing to accept the leadership of a Catholic order though himself a Protestant. Weinsberg, however, hardly noticed it, probably because not regalia, but a single chain is handed over in the image. The crowd behind the table is indeed the French nobility as Weinsberg guessed, to mark that they also acknowledged the new king. This is another aspect of the image, which was overlooked by Weinsberg.

Figures no. 18-20 are indeed clergymen, one of them is the bishop and the other two, whom Weinsberg could not recognize—or at least he did not write anything about them—are the two confessors of Henry III. The image shows that the king managed to confess and
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360 “das Guldene Floß” Discours, wahrhaftige Erzehlung, Bv.
361 Hamilton, Pierre de L'Estoile, 97.
received the last sacrament before dying—in fact he wanted to do so but died too soon. Weinsberg also has nothing to say about it.

The next scene (no. 21) marks the “execution” of the monk with a sudden shift to the right side of the image because the numbering of the image follows the narrative of the pamphlet. As shown previously, Weinsberg read the picture in a different order. Later, in no. 22 the engraver shows that the new king wrote a letter, in which he remembered the late king with deep sorrow. The copy of this letter is also inserted into the text of the pamphlet. No. 23 marks the sarcophagus of Henry III, so Weinsberg correctly guessed that this scene is about the funeral. Because it is the sarcophagus of the late king, that is why there is the coat of arms with lilies and a helmet, which Weinsberg seems to recognize as the French royal coat of arms—unsurprisingly, as he was fascinated by coats of arms from his youth.

The last but one number (24) indeed marks the new king, thus Weinsberg again guessed correctly that the only person in the group who wore a hat was the most important one. The sarcophagus is surrounded by a large group. This group is meant to show the knights of the new ruler, illustrating the handover of power and replacement of the whole elite. Finally, no. 25 depicts the cardinal, Charles Bourbon (1523-1590), the uncle of the new king. The Catholic League wanted him to become the new ruler, but he recognized Henry IV, which is why he is depicted among the people of the new king. At the same time, similarly to the Golden Fleece allusion, his inclusion may also suggest that even Catholics supported the new ruler.

---

To sum up, on a basic level Weinsberg could clearly understand the image. There are no serious misunderstandings or discrepancies between the intention of the engraver and Weinsberg’s perception. However, he understood few of the more subtle messages of the image. As in the case of the muster of the Spanish Armada, Weinsberg again did not mention the main message: the whole drama of the sudden death of the king, the transition of power—and especially its smooth way to legitimize the new king—and the emphasis on the Catholic religion. However, his long description of the engraving shows how important visual sources were for him in the acquisition of news.
Conclusion

As it has been demonstrated throughout the thesis, Weinsberg’s diary is (partly) based on printed sources and printers published what they deemed to be interesting for their readership. The printed news on the market basically met Weinsberg’s expectations. His main interest lay in the military and political news and recorded the greatest political and military events of his time. Recurring topics in his diary are royal and diplomatic correspondence, decrees and orders, alliances, treaties, deaths and successions, decisive battles and sieges, assassinations and assassination attempts, executions and massacres. He tended to view contemporary politics as an endless series of conflicts. The greatest victims of these conflicts were the “common men,” and his sole hope was that his descendants would live in a more peaceful world.

This thesis concentrated on the ways Weinsberg described and edited his printed sources through case studies selected and arranged in growing order of complexity concerning the transmission and absorption process. One can see that printed sources played a major role among the sources of Weinsberg, especially when he reported about foreign news. In these cases he preferred them to oral sources. Printed visual sources were also important for him. Despite his huge appetite for news it seems rather accidental when he was able to get some pieces of information and when not, a phenomenon professional newswriter also struggled with.

365 Cust, “News and Politics,” 76.
366 “Der arm gemeinß man und ander gut leude moissen das crutzs und last tragen.” W S 586v, 15 July 1586.
367 “uber vil jaren wan es gut fridt im lande wirt sin” W S 486v, 7 January 1585.
368 Cf. Schnurr, Religionskonflikt, 473.
Similarly to the different types of printed news publications, which frequently emphasised in their title that they were truthful and veritable, Weinsberg’s main goal was also to write “the truth,” “as it truly was.” His aim, which resembles the approaches of the sixteenth-century historian Johannes Sleidan as well as the nineteenth-century historian Leopold von Ranke (“as it actually happened”) led him to place great emphasis on the evaluation of his sources. According to Matthew Lundin, Weinsberg “developed a rudimentary form of source criticism.”

In establishing the credibility of his sources, their factual accuracy was one of the most important factors for Weinsberg. Likewise, he himself tried to record events concentrating on these pieces of factual information, “with all [their] circumstances, such as who, what, where, when, how, etc.” He tried to give precise reference to time, place and people when describing news. Consequently, his reporting of news is full of factual information which is emphasised by his plain, clear and accurate style of narrating, similar to that of his source materials. While using his printed sources to write up his diary, Weinsberg’s goals, methods and style reflected contemporary practices of the newswriters. On the other hand, his methods were shaped by his own professional practice as well, both as a merchant and as a councillor.

Weinsberg clearly distinguished between factual information and evaluation in his source materials, and while paying great attention to record the former, he tended to neglect the latter. Partly because he may have worked under the assumption that he did not need to attract his potential readers or persuade them and partly because he probably expected his

369 See for example, Andrew Pettegree, The Invention of News. How the World Came to Know About Itself (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 251-268.  
370 “wie es in der warheit were” W S 589v, 22 July 1586.  
372 Lundin, Paper Memory, 251. See also Schnurr, Religionskonflikt, 476.  
373 “mit allen circumstancien und umbstenden, als wer, was, wa, wanne, wie und derglichen” W I 7v, “Dem erenthaften fleisligsten zukunftigen hausfatter zu Weinsberch, minem geliebten erben.”
future readers to be interested also rather in factual information, as he was, he tended to omit
the most attention seeking and most emotional phrases. Although he rarely questioned factual
information, he clearly rejected material which was obviously biased for him. However, there
were limits to his critical approach: when facing two or more narratives, that radically
contradicted each other, he avoided deciding which was “true” and simply juxtaposed them,
as in the case of the different reports on the assassination of Henry III.

Weinsberg applied different editing methods to write up the news into his diary from
simple copying through reduction of the text to summarising. He tended to apply verbatim
copying when he worked with charters or other legal documents and with documents issued
by authorities. He also tended to copy lists (such as lists of gifts or ships) and poems (for
instance, in the case of the description of the Armada).

The structuring of the diary entries also resembles that of his printed news: realistic
reportage followed by a more personal closing section. These latter parts of the pamphlets
usually contain admonitions or instructions to the readers how to interpret the news or other
comments of the author. Weinsberg usually did not copy these closing parts but substituted
them with his own opinion, and in this way he also engaged in discourse with his readers.
Consequently his diary entries formally look similar to that of the pamphlets.

One can observe the biggest differences exactly in these closing sections. Unlike the
authors of the pamphlets who were restricted by censorship or were commissioned by
authorities, in his private diary Weinsberg could be completely outspoken and able to share
his frank opinion with his readers, elaborate and comment on topics. For example, as shown
above, he was not persuaded by the pamphlet suggesting that a murder could be a laudable
deed. Apart from complaining about the lack of information, the most frequently mentioned
word in these passages is “God.” Almost all events had some providential significance for
him, they were all proofs for God’s interference into human history. This fits well with the basically educational purpose of his diary, but this approach was in fact very much characteristic of news pamphlets as well. Both “were part of a culture which was both highly invested in providential discourses and increasingly concerned to establish the authenticity of their accounts.”

The next potential step of the research may be the comparison of Weinsberg’s diary with the news diaries mentioned in the Introduction. This can be done in the context of textual analysis, studying how the diarists edited and described their news, in a similar way, as in this thesis. Another approach could be to study these diaries in the terms of the early modern culture of collecting. However, the most important would probably be the study of the impact of the news, that is, how the diarists commented and reacted to the material they collected, how the news shaped their political attitudes and world view.

---

375 Nicolas Moon, “‘This is Attested Truth:’ The Rhetoric of Truthfulness in Early Modern Broadside Ballads,” in News in Early Modern Europe: Currents and Connections, ed. Simon Davies and Puck Fletcher (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 249.
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